

Office of this JOURNAL and of the WEEKLY REPORTER  
now at 12, Cook's-court, Carey-street, W.C.  
Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—Town, 26s.,  
Country 28s.; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment  
in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers  
can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d.;  
half-bound, 6s.

We must draw the attention of correspondents to the rule  
that all letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors'  
Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer,  
though not necessarily for publication.  
As difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with  
regularity in the Provinces, it is requested that application be  
made direct to the Publisher.

## The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, AUGUST 1, 1874.

"CALLING THE ROLL after an engagement" must always be a painful process, and it is not without some natural satisfaction that we review the havoc which the past few years have made in the fair line of measures for the reform of the law. Our readers will find elsewhere in our columns remarks on the engagement. Here we shall only specify the bare results. These are as follows:—The Judicature Act is not to come into operation until November, 1875, or some earlier date to be fixed by Her Majesty in Council. The Judicature Amendment Bill and the Irish Judicature Bill have been withdrawn. The Land Titles and Transfer Bill has also been withdrawn. The Limitation Bill and the Vendors and Purchasers Bill have passed.

PUBLIC ATTENTION has been called during the past week to the subject of the abolition of the Surrey Assize both by the *Times* reporter, who has given an interesting historical account of the ancient assizes in the county, and by the Grand Jury of the county, who have made a presentment, deprecating the abolition of the assize. In this country threatened institutions live long, and it may be that we shall yet see another assize at Guildford, notwithstanding the prevailing opinion that the present is the last. In 1870 a similar opinion prevailed almost as strongly as now, though with less foundation than there appears to be for the present belief.

It was announced by the Attorney-General, only a few days before notice was given of the postponement of the coming into operation of the Judicature Act, that a new scheme for the arrangement of the circuits had been decided on, and would be made public simultaneously with the new rules. We cannot help suspecting, however, that a difficulty arose as to carrying out the proposed arrangement, and that probably this difficulty was one of the causes which led to the postponement. It is generally understood that the new scheme left the number of the circuits the same as at present; for, although the Home Circuit was to be absorbed, and thus the number reduced by one, a new circuit was to be created in the North. That being so, the same number of judges would be required to travel circuit as at present, namely, fourteen. Under the Judicature Act the judges of the common law divisions are to be reduced from the present number, eighteen, to fifteen, so that if fourteen travelled circuit there would be but one judge left to hold the intended sitting in town, to attend at chambers, and to try any election petitions. It seems clear, therefore, that unless the new scheme for the circuits is one requiring fewer judges to work it than the present, some more judges liable to go circuit must be made. It will be remembered that Sir H. James brought forward a proposition a few weeks ago (the consideration of which was adjourned) to increase the number of judges from fifteen to eighteen, and simultaneously a proposition was made that the judges of the probate and admiralty divisions should go circuit.

All this points to the difficulty we have suggested, and without pretending to have any authoritative information, we cannot doubt that this was one of the causes for the postponement.

As the difficulty has not been solved yet, it follows that the mode of its solution may be found in some further alteration of the new scheme for circuits decided on, but not made public. It must therefore be taken that the future arrangements for circuits are wholly uncertain, and however probable the abolition of the Surrey assize may appear it is by no means yet accomplished. Having regard to the expressed wish of the county magistrates, and to the undoubted fact that a considerable part of the county is at a greater distance from town than other places where it is proposed to retain assizes, it may be that the required object may be attained without abolishing the Surrey assize. The judges holding it might sit for a week in Surrey, disposing in that time of the criminal business, and of such civil causes as could be more conveniently tried in the country, and then return and hold a sitting, say for a fortnight, in town. This would be more convenient to everybody than the present system. Whether it would be better than the new scheme, which is understood to have been decided on by the judges, is a matter on which it is difficult to form an opinion upon mere report, and until the details of that scheme are published.

THE REMAINING CLAUSES of the Public Worship Regulation Bill passed through committee in the House of Commons on Tuesday without any serious opposition, Mr. Gladstone having gone away to Scotland. The most important alteration introduced was one giving an appeal to the archbishop, in case the bishop to whom a representation was made refused to refer it to the judge. In adopting this amendment, and at the same time refusing an appeal where the bishop did refer the case to the judge, the committee seem to us to have exercised a sound practical discretion. In the former case it is necessary to give an appeal unless each individual bishop is to be left altogether at liberty to refuse to enforce the law in his diocese. But where a representation has been referred to the judge by a bishop it is extremely unlikely that the archbishop will stop the proceedings, and moreover, if an appeal had been allowed in such a case the whole responsibility of setting the law in motion would have rested with the two archbishops instead of being shared between them and those bishops who also refer cases to the judge.

Another important alteration was the striking out of a clause exempting from the operation of the Bill college chapels, the chapels of endowed schools, and private chapels. There might have been no harm in exempting private chapels, but to give exceptional licence as to ritual to college and school chapels, from which young clergymen derive their ideas of ritual far more than from the parish churches they attend during their vacations, would have to a considerable extent defeated the object of the Bill. The Act of Uniformity of Charles II. contains a special clause as to college chapels, probably because some of the principal complaints about excessive ritual in Charles I.'s reign were connected with such chapels.

Mr. Cowper Temple's proposal that the bishop should consult a public meeting of the parishioners as to any representation, before deciding whether proceedings should be taken thereon, was negatived without a division. Although in some cases a bishop might properly take into account whether the matters complained of produced general dissatisfaction or not, yet obviously there are other cases much more numerous in which this consideration is altogether out of place, and in no case would it form more than one of several elements to be taken into account, and therefore ought not to be specially recognised in the Bill.

Mr. Beresford Hope's attempt to extend the Bill to bishops was rightly defeated by a large majority.

Although it is indisputable that bishops ought to obey the law themselves, no serious charges of disobedience have been brought against any of them, and if they are to have a discretion as to allowing proceedings against other clergymen, it is extremely important that they should not be liable to be intimidated or harassed by frivolous accusations.

As soon as the Bill had passed through committee Mr. Disraeli gave notice of a clause, charging not more than £3,000 a year for three years on the Consolidated Fund for the judge's salary, and the next day (Wednesday) this proposal passed through its first stage, though not without considerable opposition. As we are going to press, however, we learn that Mr. Disraeli, on Friday afternoon, moved, and the House assented to, the discharge of the order for considering the report on the resolution of the committee authorizing the payment of the judge's salary out of the Consolidated Fund, the reason assigned by Mr. Disraeli being that the services of a judge of the highest eminence had been secured, who would require no remuneration beyond the pension to which he was already entitled.

IS IT TOO MUCH to expect that the lengthening of the interval before the coming into operation of the Judicature Act may be taken advantage of to present the profession and the public with a compact and complete code of procedure under the new system? As our readers are well aware, the Act of 1873 is absolutely bare of repeals, and however exhaustive the new rules might be, the whole of the existing procedure—Chancery Procedure Acts, and Consolidated Orders, Common Law Procedure Acts, and Common Law Rules of Court—was not only impliedly but expressly left standing (see Judicature Act, section 73, which saves "all forms and methods of procedure in force under any law, custom, general orders, or rules whatsoever," not inconsistent with the Act, the rules in the schedule, or the rules of court). If the breathing space made by the postponement of the Act is properly utilized, it would not be impossible to emulate, with respect to the old procedure, the practice that was followed with respect to stamps in 1870, by 33 & 34 Vict. c. 99, and with respect to oaths in 1871, by 34 & 35 Vict. c. 48.

THE HOME RULE members on Saturday last, and again on Thursday, conferred a great benefit on the country by calling emphatic attention to the evils of the practice of embracing, in an Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, a number of important Acts, the necessity and policy of continuing which ought to be carefully considered by the Legislature, while under the practice alluded to they are hurried through Parliament at a period when members are either "exhausted or excited," and in a form which repels instead of inviting discussion and consideration. We reported this time last year (17 S. J. 793) some very severe strictures made on the practice by two distinguished peers who are now members of the Government. Their influence, however, while in office, does not seem to have enabled them to prevent the Government from adopting this easy plan of shortening their labours. The Bill of the present session comprised more than thirty Acts, some of which, such as the Master and Servant Act and the Election Petitions and Corrupt Practices Act, in the opinion of many persons, need revision and alteration. Fortunately three of the Acts were Irish Coercion Acts, and there was a strong muster of Irish members to protest against this method of smuggling those Acts through the House. On the side of the Government there was hardly any one so bold as to defend the propriety of including in a continuance Bill Acts of a character necessarily raising discussion. Mr. Disraeli, indeed, promised that the Coercion Acts, if it should be necessary to continue them, should not again be dealt with in this way, but should be introduced separately and early in the session. We hope that this treatment may be extended to all Acts the continuance of which is at all open to question. With this

view it would be well to restore the practice of appointing a committee to consider the Bills to be continued. Such a committee could sift out of the mass of expiring laws all such as were at all likely to lead to discussion; and if the committee were appointed and reported early in each session, the dangers springing from the convenient practice of a continuance Bill would be reduced to a minimum.

OUR READERS will find in our issue of this week a full report of the annual general meeting of the Incorporated Law Society held on Friday, the 24th of July. The subjects discussed were of much interest, and many of the suggestions of the speakers will be found well worthy of consideration. One of them was that, with respect to the usages of the profession, the Council should communicate to the members the decisions they may from time to time arrive at. It was pointed out that this would lead to uniformity of practice, and that the communication might conveniently be made at the annual provincial meetings. Mr. Keen gave an interesting instance of the activity of the Council in a matter which they had not mentioned in their report. Various suggestions were made for increasing the weight and influence of solicitors as a body, and for this purpose it was urged that all solicitors should join the society. With this view one of the speakers advocated the abolition of the admission fee. Several criticisms were made on the recent proceedings of the Council; but the point which raised most discussion was the action of the Council last year in issuing a list of selected candidates for election. The chairman declined to commit the Council to a positive assurance that such a step will never be taken again. We may, however, feel pretty confident that it has been taken for the last time.

#### THE POSTPONEMENT OF THE JUDICATURE ACT.

The postponement of the commencement of the Judicature Act, though not altogether unexpected, seems to have been determined upon at the last with startling suddenness. Up to the very day on which the intended withdrawal of the supplementary Bills was announced in the House of Commons there seems to have been no idea of postponement in the minds of the legal advisers of the Government. The withdrawal of the Amendment Bill, however, practically necessitated this postponement, as it would have been manifestly absurd to allow a measure to come into operation containing such defects as those admitted on all hands to exist in the Act as it stands. The loss, though but for a year, of any possibility of second appeal would, we think, have been an evil far greater than the corresponding delay in the reforms effected by the Act. It is, however, to be hoped that the Government will in the interval find their hands so far strengthened by the action taken this year by Sir H. James and other lawyers on that side of the House; who, when freed from official control, were ready enough to denounce the injudicious parsimony which provided for a reduction in the judicial staff just when adding considerably to the labours of the judges, already overworked; that they will be able to amend the Act in this particular also. The spectacle of two out of our four Equity Courts of first instance occupied for three days a week during the whole of the "long sittings" with a single cause each; the delay arising mainly, if not entirely, from the fact that the evidence was taken *viva voce* in court; is a somewhat effective commentary on the provisions in question. Do not let us be misunderstood: we assent unreservedly to the proposition that in every case of disputed fact the witnesses ought to be examined and cross-examined in open court at the hearing: but then we must be prepared to encounter the inevitable result that trials of equity causes will on the average occupy more than three times the judicial time at present employed upon them. This need not be any loss to the suitors, who will save more in the abolition of "wars of

appoint.  
continued.  
expiring  
scusson;  
ted the early  
duced to

ek a full  
Incorpo-  
rally. The  
many of  
nd well  
at, with  
Council  
ons they  
ted out  
and that  
at the  
interest-  
matter  
Various  
ight and  
pose it  
society.  
abol-  
made  
point of  
the  
dicates  
it the  
never  
fident

ACT.  
indica-  
to have  
iden-  
with-  
n the  
ea of  
the  
Bill,  
as it  
sure  
those  
unds.  
y of  
l far  
forms  
the far  
er H.  
who  
on to  
ded  
hen  
ady  
t in  
our  
re a  
ch a  
not  
en  
ary  
er  
in  
x-  
g:  
ple  
oc-  
nt  
he

affidavits" and that most effectual instrument for the waste of time and money, cross-examination before an examiner, than they will lose by the extra time occupied in court. But the result to the country must be one of two things; either a renewal of the old delays which made the Court of Chancery a byword years ago, or a largely increased judicial force occupied in hearing equity causes. The latter alternative would not necessarily involve a corresponding increase in the strength of "the Chancery Division," because under the new system there would be nothing to prevent any judge of the High Court from trying these causes "at Nisi Prius," or whatever may hereafter be substituted therefor; and the labours of the division might be further lightened by a liberal use of the power of "transfer," particularly if exercised with some discrimination as to the nature of the causes transferred, and not merely by wholesale operations upon the cause list as it stands. But all this would entail additional work on the judges of the other divisions, and it is wilful blindness, if not worse, to shut our eyes to the fact that these have already as much as they can do, and that there is nothing in the Act which in any way tends to lighten their labours. If the Amendment Bill of 1875 shall restore the judicial staff to that proposed by the Bill of 1873 as it left the House of Lords, the public will have no cause to complain of the comparatively trifling delay which will have brought about so satisfactory a result.

It will be readily perceived that these remarks have no application to the proposed reductions on the Irish Bench, as to which we have already expressed an opinion which we see no reason to modify or retract. Information, however, which has reached us from various quarters in Ireland, some of them eminently entitled to a voice on this question, leads us somewhat to vary the details of the plan which we formerly submitted to the public, and we propose to take an early opportunity of re-discussing the whole subject.

#### MALICE.

The difficult question of what constitutes malice has received further illustration in the case of *Reg. v. Pemblton*, 22 W. R. 553. The prisoner was indicted under 24 & 25 Vict. c. 97, s. 51, for "unlawfully and maliciously" committing damage (exceeding £5) to property by breaking a window. In fact, he broke the window with a stone which he flung at some person standing near, but the jury negatived any intention to break the window. On a case reserved the Court of Criminal Appeal held that he had not committed an offence under the statute, though they intimated an opinion that if the jury had found that when he threw the stone he knew that it was probable it would break the window, he would have been guilty. The first thing to observe on this is that the court held that, in using the word "maliciously," the statute did not mean a general unlawful intent, but an intent to do the unlawful act of damaging property. But, in the second place, in intimating (what we have no doubt they would if necessary have held) that it would have been sufficient to bring him within the statute if he had known the damage to property to be a probable consequence of his act, and yet had done it, they say in effect that there need not be a purpose to do the damage; it is enough if there is a recklessness.

The decision appears to us one of great importance, for it indicates, though it does not precisely lay down, a distinction which has been hardly enough recognised in law, and which has indeed been sometimes deliberately ignored. It would not be wrong to describe this distinction as a distinction between the quality and the quantity of the intent. It is established law and sound reason that if a man does an act which produces what may be fairly described as a necessary consequence, that is, such a consequence as any person doing the act would necessarily foresee, it is all one as

though he intended that consequence, although that consequence was not the purpose or motive of his action. In the language of the law (which, if in this respect not perfectly logical, is practically convenient and could not be easily replaced by any other way of speaking) he did *intend* the consequence. This is the effect of what the court in the present case intimated they would have held if the jury had found that the prisoner knew the probable consequence of his act to be the breaking of the window; and this is what the court did decide in *Reg. v. Ward*, 20 W. R. 392, L. R. 1 C. C. R. 356, where the prisoner was held guilty of "unlawfully and maliciously" wounding a man, though he had no malice against the particular individual, and did not even design to shoot him, but fired in his direction in such a way that the hitting of him was the natural and probable consequence of his act. The probable consequence was necessarily within his contemplation, and was recklessly disregarded. There was *enough* intention to make malice, though the intention was not coupled with a purpose.

But on the other hand, if the only thing intended is altogether different from the consequence which actually follows, where the actual consequence is not only beyond the purpose but beyond the contemplation of the person doing the act, where it is not only undesigned, but is not such a consequence as he may fairly be held to have foreseen as probable, then no intention to produce the consequence can be rightly attributed, and the act cannot be said to be done maliciously.

Here, however, a qualification arises, which turns upon the quality or nature of the intent. If the prisoner in the case in question could fairly be held to have had in his contemplation that his throwing the stone would probably cause damage to property, we think we shall not be wrong in saying that he would have been held guilty, although the precise damage done was not that which he contemplated. If, for instance, throwing the stone recklessly in the direction of one window, the stone had glanced off and struck another window. This would be like the old and undoubted case of poison laid for A. and taken by B., or one person shot at and another killed. The quality or nature of the intent answers to the effect produced, or the consequence which follows is of the same nature and quality with that intended, though the precise operation is different. There is not a mere general intent to do an unlawful act; but there is an intent to do an unlawful act and produce an unlawful consequence of a particular kind; and an unlawful act of that particular kind is in fact done, and an unlawful consequence of that particular kind produced.

It appears to us that this is a true and reasonable distinction, and the one that must ultimately prevail. And it is this distinction that is so grossly violated by the old *dicta* laying down that any homicide done in the course of a felonious act is murder. We have on a former occasion stated our conviction that this technical and arbitrary rule would not now be acted upon, and we are glad to observe that in the present case Blackburn and Lush, JJ., both intimate their dissent from it. Lord Coleridge, however, guards himself against being "supposed to throw any doubt upon the authorities which have been cited to show what is sufficient to constitute malice in the case of murder; they rest upon principles of common law, and do not appear to be applicable to an offence created by statutory enactment." We cannot appreciate this reasoning. When a statute uses the term *malice*, it must be supposed to use it in the sense which it has acquired in law; and if a particular state of circumstances would prove malice at common law the like circumstances ought equally to prove it under the statute. It appears to us impossible that the construction of the words of a statute should not reflect back upon the construction of similar words in a branch of common law which is *in pari materia* with the statute. We regard the present case in that light, and look upon it as one of great and leading importance.

## RECENT DECISIONS.

## PRIVY COUNCIL.

CERTIORARI—INFERIOR COURTS—JURISDICTION.  
*Colonial Bank of Australasia v. Willan, P.C.*  
 22 W. R. 516.

Of the somewhat lengthy facts in this case it is sufficient to say that a winding-up order having been made against a company at the suit of the appellants in the Court of Mines of the colony of Victoria, a shareholder in the company, the respondent in the appeal, obtained a *certiorari* in the Supreme Court, and thereupon an order quashing the order in the court below, substantially on the grounds, first, that there was no debt to support the winding-up petition; secondly, that the order was obtained by fraud. The Privy Council reversed the decision of the court below, and the judgment will be useful as a review of the rules acted upon by the Court of Queen's Bench in the matter of *certiorari*, when, the *certiorari* in its wider form being taken away, the action of the court in its control over the inferior court is limited in its scope. The Privy Council, referring to the decisions in the Court of Queen's Bench, say—"Some of these authorities establish, and none are inconsistent with the proposition that, in any such case, that court will not quash the order removed, except upon the ground either of a manifest defect of jurisdiction in the tribunal that made it, or of manifest fraud in the party procuring it." To this there must, we think, be added the case of manifest misconduct, amounting to legal corruption, in the court making the order; but with that addition (which is, perhaps, meant to be included in the first class) we believe this statement of the result of the decisions is correct. The interpretation of the first of these exceptions is more difficult. The judgment enumerates four forms in which the question of "want of jurisdiction" may arise. First, with respect to the character and constitution of the tribunal. This is clear; whether the tribunal was in fact legally constituted must always be examinable; as, for instance, whether one justice only sat where two were required, or whether he sat beyond the limits of his jurisdiction, or whether he was disqualified by interest. Secondly, with respect to the subject-matter of the inquiry. This also, taken (as is meant) with reference to the root of the inquiry, is clear. Thirdly, with respect to preliminaries which have been made essential to entering on the inquiry, as in *Reg. v. Arkwright* (12 Q. B. 960). This also is clear; though with respect to preliminaries, which it is within the competence of the inferior court to determine upon, it is settled that their decision will not be interfered with. Fourthly, and this is the most difficult class of cases, the question may concern facts which have to be adjudicated upon in the course of the inquiry, and the determination of which in one way ousts the jurisdiction, or which would, but for the fact that their determination is necessary to the inquiry, transcend the limits of the inferior jurisdiction. To the former head belong the cases where the point arises whether a question of title is *bonâ fide* raised. Upon this point it is said in the judgment (referring to the church rate cases) that it may be doubtful whether the court would have exercised its summary jurisdiction if there had been evidence on which the magistrates might have reasonably concluded that the question of title was not raised *bonâ fide*. This appears to raise a false issue. If there was such evidence for the magistrates, then also such evidence existed for the court, and what is said comes only to this, that if there was reasonable evidence that the question was not raised *bonâ fide*, the court would not hold that it was. If it means more than this, the proposition is doubtful. To the latter head belong such cases as *Ex parte Vaughan* (15 W. R. 198, L. R. 2 Q. B. 114), where it was held that justices could try a question of title to land, because it was necessarily involved in the inquiry which they were expressly empowered to make. But it is not always

easy to determine whether the inquiry does so necessarily involve the question of title as to give jurisdiction to try it.

In the present case the existence of a debt from the company to the petitioning creditor was clearly a matter which the Court of Mines was bound to try. Moreover the Privy Council were not satisfied that such a debt did not exist. With respect to the alleged fraud, it consisted, first, in serving the notice at the registered office of the company, and on its registered manager, when the company had ceased to carry on business, but had not been wound up, nor removed that name and address from the register; and secondly, in giving too short a notice. As to the first, as the creditor was bound so to act, there was no fraud; as to the second, as a matter of fact the court declined to treat the notice as fraudulent. It may be added that the court pointed out four other and more convenient remedies open to the respondent if he had ground of complaint, and under these circumstances could not look favourably on the course adopted.

## COMMON LAW.

## SECURITY FOR COSTS.

*Raeburn v. Andrews*, Q.B., 22 W. R. 489, L. R. 9 Q. B. 118.

The Judgments Extension Act, 1868, section 2, having provided that a certificate registered in Edinburgh of a judgment entered up in a superior court at Westminster, is to have "the same force and effect as a decree of the Court of Session," so that a defendant who recovers judgment for his costs in England can have an immediate remedy for them against a plaintiff resident in Scotland, it follows as a logical consequence that, *cessante ratione*, the rule also ceases which required a plaintiff in Scotland, suing here, to give security for costs. And we presume the same consequence would follow with respect to any foreign nation with whom, by treaty, a similar right was secured.

## REVIEWS.

## TRADE MARKS.

*A Treatise on the Law of Trade-marks*. By F. M. ADAMS, Barrister-at-Law. London: George Bell & Sons.

We have too long delayed noticing this useful addition to our not very extensive catalogue of books dealing with the law of trade-marks. Any investigation into this branch of the law involves the citation of large numbers of cases, and the deducing or attempting to deduce therefrom principles more or less general. This is what Mr. Adams has laid himself out to accomplish, and his researches and exertions have resulted in a fair amount of success. It is difficult to imagine any possible trademark question upon which some information cannot be gleaned from the book under notice. Some of the most difficult points connected with the subject—*e.g.*, the multiplication of the right to use a trade-mark—are discussed tolerably exhaustively. After citing and commenting on *Bury v. Bedford* (10 Jur. N. S. 503) and *Southern v. Reynolds* (12 L. T. N. S. 75, 13 W. R. Ch. Dig. 88), Mr. Adams says:—"By following these decisions we are led to the conclusion that the rule of the courts of equity upon this part of the subject is consistent with the multiplication of a right to a trade-mark, provided the mark be capable of transfer at all. But upon this state of things two questions suggest themselves. How far is this process of sharing the right to be carried, and how is the practice to be reconciled with the principles generally laid down for protecting trade-marks? Could it be said that any number of descendants might each, in this respect, inherit the privileges of a common ancestor? There is no authority for saying at what point a line should be drawn, but it is apprehended that the principle is not capable

of any great extension; indeed, even in *Dent v. Turpin* it was regretted by the court that the two parties had not made some substantial difference in their mode of marking their goods. But further than this, the jurisdiction of a court of equity is based upon the principle that when a person comes to seek for protection against an infringement of his mark he is understood to say, in effect—"This mark placed upon my goods is, or ought to be, an assurance to the public that, in buying these goods, they are paying for the superior quality of the work done at my establishment." What is his position, then, in a court of equity, when it appears that the mark in question has ceased to have that meaning attached to it? Indeed, in the case of *Batty v. Hill*, the court seems to have thought that the possibility of the right being shared by others would be fatal to the claims of either."

Another similar subject which is discussed is the devolution of a trade-mark on the dissolution of a partnership. After discussing *Hall v. Barrows* (12 W. R. 322), *Banks v. Gibson* (13 W. R. 1012), and other cases, Mr. Adams says:—"A comparison of the cases leads, therefore, to the conclusion that, in the absence of express stipulation in the partnership articles, and subject to the conditions inseparable from any assignment of a trade-mark, as that it should not result in a deception or fraud upon purchasers, after the decease of one partner, the goodwill and trade-mark, whether consisting of the names of the partners or not, would go with and form part of the partnership assets; and that, after a dissolution of partnership, an outgoing partner, upon the sale of his share of the assets, would be entitled to an injunction to restrain the future use of his name as part of the designation of the firm, but that the purchaser would, with the exception of the retiring partner's name, be entitled to all the benefit attaching to the goodwill and continued use of the trade-mark."

#### WORKS RECEIVED.

*A Treatise on the Doctrine of Ultra Vires.* By Seward Bruce, M.A., LL.D., Barrister-at-Law. Stevens & Haynes.

*The Liability of Innkeepers.* By the Hon. F. C. Maxwell, Barrister-at-Law. Maxwell & Son.

*A Treatise on the Law of Copyholds and Customary Tenures of Land.* By CHARLES ELTON, Barrister-at-Law. Wm. & Sons.

*Impediments to the Transfer of Land.* By GEORGE SWEET, Esq., of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law. A Paper read before the Juridical Society, March 19th, 1873. Wm. & Sons, and W. Ridgway.

*Sessional Proceedings of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science.* Vol. 7, No. 12, containing a paper on the Land Transfer Bills by the same author, read May 11th, 1874. P. S. King.

*Observations on the Land Titles and Transfer Bill.* By the same author. Henry Sweet.

#### NOTES.

##### HOME.

The decision of the judge of the Sheffield County Court in *Re Hirst*, which we noticed last week (*ante p. 724*), has been reversed by the Chief Judge in Bankruptcy. His Lordship held that it is sufficient, under the Bankruptcy Rules 256 and 257, if the notices summoning a meeting of creditors are signed with the name of the debtor's attorney, though the name is in fact written by the attorney's clerk for his principal and with his authority. This view seems to be consistent with common sense. We believe it is the practice in large offices to have the forms of these notices prepared with the solicitor's name printed at the foot.

The Lords Justices have given leave to present an appeal to the House of Lords in *Ex parte Butcher*, 22 W. R. 731 (and see *supra*, p. 643), which involved, as our readers will

remember, a very important question as to the construction of section 92 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, with regard to fraudulent preferences, namely, whether creditors, who receive payment of their debts without notice of the debtor's insolvency or of the fact that they are being preferred, are within the protection of the proviso at the end of the section. There being a number of other cases in the same bankruptcy involving the same question, the permission to appeal was given at the instance of a creditor for a large sum, who could get nothing unless the payments made to preferred creditors could be recovered, but only on the terms of his undertaking to indemnify the respondent against costs, whatever the result of the appeal, and to deposit £500 in court for that purpose.

Upon an application on Thursday to Hall, V.C., in the matter of a limited company, with reference to the appointment of a liquidator, and the hearing of the petition to wind up the company during the long vacation, his Honour said he had conferred with the Master of the Rolls upon the course to be adopted in these cases; and the Vice-Chancellor wished it to be understood that winding-up petitions would, in the vacation, be treated in the same way as all other petitions were then dealt with. If they were not very urgent in their nature they would receive that amount of attention which was not always agreeable to the parties presenting them—they would be dismissed with costs.

#### FOREIGN.

##### UNITED STATES.

The *Albany Law Journal* reports the following decision of the Supreme Court of Illinois under a statute in that case made and provided:—"The action was brought by a widow to recover damages for injury to her means of support, by reason of the death of her husband. The evidence showed that the husband got a drink of whisky at the saloon of the defendant on the afternoon before his death, became intoxicated, and was seen going into the saloon of defendant as well as of others. He was found next morning on the railroad track, cut to pieces, evidently by a passing train, and the court held this was sufficient to warrant the jury in finding the cause of his death to be intoxication, produced "in whole or in part" by the liquor sold him at the defendant's saloon, and that it was no defence to show that other persons sold liquor to the deceased that might have contributed to his intoxication. The jury assessed the damages against defendant at 2,000 dols."

The same journal has the following report of another recent case:—A novel question was presented in *Williams v. Firemen's Fund Insurance Company*, 54 N. Y. 569. The action was on a fire policy, containing a prohibition against storing petroleum, etc., on the premises. The defendant claimed an infraction of this provision. It seemed that the plaintiff, who had been in the army during the late war, had received a gunshot wound resulting in a cutaneous disorder, which he treated by an application of crude petroleum oil to the surface of his body, and for that purpose he kept crude petroleum in a jug on a shelf in his room, and had some quarts of it in the building at the time of the fire. It was not pretended that the fire proceeded from or was aided by this material. The court held that this was not a "storing" within the meaning of the policy. Commissioner Reynolds suggested that even if the plaintiff had taken a quantity of the oil internally it would not have amounted to a "storing" on the premises. We are very glad this is so settled. Any other decision would have been an ungenerous requital for the suffering of the plaintiff in the cause of his country, and would operate to retard enlistments in the event of another unholy rebellion. Let it once be adjudged that a man must not only bleed but itch for his country, unallayed by emollients of an inflammable nature, or run the risk of having his property destroyed by fire without the power of enforcing his insurance, and our liberties are no longer secure.

The Bill to delay the operation of the Judicature Act of 1873, to the 1st of November, 1875, has been printed. Her Majesty is to be empowered by an order in council to appoint an earlier period for the statute coming into force.

## COURTS.

## BANKRUPTCY.

(Before Mr. Registrar HAZLITT, sitting as Chief Judge.)

June 22.—*Ex parte Figgins, Re Smyth.**Executor, petitioner for liquidation, cannot, without an order of the court, prove under his own petition in respect of a debt due from him to his testator's estate.*

This was an application on behalf of Messrs. Figgins, executors of I. J. Smyth, for an order that the decision or order of Mr. Registrar Keene, ordering registration of a resolution of creditors, should be set aside or varied.

Among the proofs tendered at the first meeting in liquidation was one of the debtor himself in these terms:—“I, Isaac John Smyth, of Holborn-buildings, Holborn, in the city of London, printer, and of 201, St. John's-street-road, in the county of Middlesex, bookseller and printer, I was at the date of the institution of the said proceedings, and still am, justly indebted to the estate of Valentine Fitzpatrick Blake, late of Dublin, Esquire, deceased, of whose will I am the only executor who proved the same, in the sum of £1,431 0s. 3d., being the amount due to the estate of the said testator, which I, as such executor, retained in my hands, and which moneys belonged to the estate of the said testator, and which sum, as to £843 2s. 9d., the interest thereof is payable to my mother Ellen Smyth, and as to £587 17s. 6d. the interest thereof is payable to Ellen Towell, the wife of George Towell, for the maintenance and education of Helena, the step-daughter of the said testator, for which said sum or any part thereof I say that I have not, nor hath any person by my order or to my knowledge or belief for my use, nor hath the estate had or received any manner of satisfaction whatsoever.”

“Sworn, &amp;c., 23rd April, 1874.”

The proof was objected to, as appeared from an indorsement by Messrs. Figgins, creditors, on the ground that the debtor had no right to vote in respect of this proof in competition with the other creditors at a first general meeting.

The objection was heard before Mr. Registrar Keene who overruled it, and, as the proof created the necessary majority, the resolution for a composition of seven and sixpence in the pound was ordered to be registered.

Bagley, for Messrs. Figgins.

Finsay Knight, for the debtor.

Mr. Registrar HAZLITT.—Under ordinary circumstances an executor has an absolute power over the debts due to his testator, and may deal with them as he pleases, and, therefore, as the Lord Chancellor said in *Stammers v. Elliott*, 16 W. R. 489, L. R. 3 Ch. 195, if he prove a debt under a bankruptcy, it has the same effect as if he were proceeding in his own right, and consequently the debt may be held to be satisfied. But, then, if he is proceeding in his own wrong? How, if having committed a fraud, and becoming bankrupt, he seeks (to adopt the language of counsel in the case of *Ex parte Shaw*, 1 Glyn & Jameson, 127, at p. 149) “to have the benefit of his breach of trust to protect himself against the very persons he has defrauded,” which is precisely the state of things here? Lord Chancellor Eldon, following Lord Chancellor Thurlow, declared in the cited case that an executor being a bankrupt is not entitled to be admitted a creditor under the commission against himself in respect of a debt claimed to be due to him as such executor. Such is the proof here. The proof itself might very fairly have been objected to in the first instance, for the words “make oath and say” are struck out and not repeated. But the objection is not raised before me on the present occasion, and if it had been, following *Ex parte Torkington*, 22 W. R. 602, L. R. 9 Ch. 298, it would have been too late. The debt described in the proof as due to the estate of the testator is owing in part to the debtor's mother and in part to a Mrs. Towell, in respect of the maintenance and education of the testator's step-daughter. It may be that these ladies having regard to their connection with the debtor are willing to help him. But it may also be that one or the other of them is not so willing. In either case the principle is the same, that

\* The words “make oath and say” struck out and not repeated.

creditors are not to be forced into the acceptance of a less amount than their debts, by a majority which is created by an irregular proof. Mr. Knight indeed suggests that the legatees would not be precluded by their proof from ultimate recourse against the debtor, but the present is the case of proof by an executor, and not, as in *Ex parte Dicken* (1 Buck. 115), of a proof by a trustee, where Lord Eldon held that proof by a trustee did not deprive the *cestui que trust* of their previous lien in respect of the debt.

I am of opinion that the debtor had no right, without the leave of the court, or by himself alone, to make this proof. It is suggested that no objection was made to the proof itself, and that consequently the proof being admitted without objection, the right to vote upon it followed. But it seems to me that the indorsement on the proof signed by the chairman shows that to all intents and purposes the proof was objected to. I therefore, in the terms of the motion, order that the decision or order of Mr. Registrar Keene ordering registration be set aside and discharged, and that if the resolution have been registered that such resolution be cancelled.

In *Ex parte Cadwallader, In re James* (31 L. J. Bkcy. 66, 10 W. R. Ch. Dig. 7), under much the same circumstances, the Lords Justices permitted a proof to be made of the persons beneficially interested, who were further permitted to vote upon such proof. If this had been done in the present instance, no question need have arisen.

Solicitors for the applicants, *Piesse & Son.*Solicitor for the respondent, *Price.*

## OXFORD CIRCUIT.

## CROWN COURT, STAFFORD.

(Before LUSH, J.)

July 23.—*Costs of Prosecutions.*

Streeten (with him *Jelf*) made an application to his Lordship for the costs of the prosecution in the cases of the Evesham rioters tried last week at Worcester. There were three different cases, the first of which terminated in an acquittal, the second in a verdict of guilty, and in the third the prosecution was withdrawn. Each indictment contained, besides the ordinary counts, a count under the Act 24 & 25 Vict. c. 97, s. 12, for riotously damaging houses. There had been no preliminary inquiry before the magistrates, and consequently no prosecutor had been bound over, but the persons who in fact prosecuted had included their own names in the subpoenas as well as the names of the other witnesses; and the question now arose whether, under the 23rd section of the Act 7 Geo. 4, c. 64, or under the 77th section of the Act 24 & 25 Vict. c. 97, the court before whom the cases were tried had power to order, not only the costs of the witnesses, but also the general costs of the prosecution. A doubt had been expressed, in the case of *Rex v. Jeyes*, 3 A. & E. 416, as to whether such an order could be made, but in the subsequent case of *Rex v. Sheering*, 7 C. & P., 440, Park and Coleridge, JJ., made such an order; and it also appeared that Parke, B., had decided to a like effect in a case of *Rex v. Butterwick*, 2 M. & R. 196. Upon the authority of these cases,

His Lordship made an order for the full costs of the prosecution in all the cases, but said that but for those authorities he should have held the other way.

It is rumoured, on apparently good authority, that Mr. G. A. C. May, Q.C., who is expected to be the new Attorney-General for Ireland, will be a candidate for the seat for Dublin University, about to be vacated by Dr. Ball, and that his candidature will be supported “by the whole strength of the Government.” If Mr. May were a graduate of that university he would doubtless be a very suitable representative; but though a very distinguished member of the Irish bar, Mr. May was educated at the University of Cambridge, and never had any connection whatever with that of Dublin. Great indignation has been expressed in high quarters at the supposed intention of treating the University as “a pocket borough,” and it is to be hoped that the report, if not well founded, will be promptly denied by both the parties implicated.

## PARLIAMENT AND LEGISLATION.

## HOUSE OF LORDS.

**July 24.—The Rating Bill.**—This Bill was read a third time and passed.

**Attorneys and Solicitors Bill.**—The Commons' amendments to this Bill were considered and agreed to.

**The Customs (Isle of Man) Bill and the Industrial and Reformatory Schools Bills.**—These Bills were read a third time and passed.

**The Revising Barristers (Payment) Bill.**—This Bill passed through committee.

**The Conveyancing and Land Transfer (Scotland) Bill.**—This Bill passed through committee.

**July 27.—Herford College (Oxford) Bill.**—The Commons' amendments in this Bill were considered and were agreed to, except so far as a date, which was now altered.

**Poor Law Amendment (Removal) Bill.**—Lord HENNIKER, in moving the second reading of this Bill, explained that it sought to do away with removal in England. He did not expect to pass it in one session, but he asked for the second reading in order that the subject might be considered throughout the winter. He would draw a more perfect Bill for next session. After some discussion the order for the second reading was discharged.

**The Alderney Harbour Bill.**—This Bill was read a second time.

**The Shannon Navigation Bill.**—This Bill was read a second time.

**The Statute Law Revision (No. 2) Bill.**—This Bill was read a second time.

**The Revising Barristers Payment Bill.**—This Bill was read a third time and passed.

**The Mersey Channels Bill.**—This Bill was read a third time and passed.

**The Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill.**—The report of amendments on this Bill was agreed to.

**The Public Health (Ireland) Bill.**—This Bill was read a second time.

**July 28.—Infanticide Bill.**—After speeches by the LORD CHANCELLOR and others disapproving of the Bill, it was rejected without a division.

**Bills Advanced a Stage.**—The Slaughterhouses, &c., Bill, the report of amendments was agreed to. The Civil Bill Courts (Ireland) Bill passed through Committee. In the Attorneys and Solicitors Bill the Commons' amendments were considered and agreed to, and certain amendments added thereto. The Police Force Expenses Bill and the Education Department Orders Bill were read a second time. In the Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (No. 2) Bill, the Commons' amendments were considered and agreed to. The Alderney Harbour Bill, the Statute Law Revision (No. 2) Bill, and the Conveyancing and Land Transfer (Scotland) Bill passed through Committee. The Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill was read a third time and passed.

**July 30.—Royal Commission.**—The Royal Assent was given by Commission to the following Bills:—Personation, Powers Law Amendment, Courts (Straits Settlement) Colonial Attorneys Relief Act Amendment, Board of Trade Arbitrations, Inquiries, &c., Building Societies, Alkali Act (1863) Amendment, Hosiery Manufactures (Wages), Intoxicating Liquors, Customs (Isle of Man), Industrial and Reformatory Schools, Factories (Health of Women, &c.), Chain Cubicles and Anchors, Revising Barristers (Payment), Local Government Board Provisional Orders Confirmation Act, 1874 (No. 4), Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (No. 1).

**Sanitary Laws Amendment Bill.**—This Bill was read a second time.

**Royal (Late Indian) Ordnance Corps Compensation Bill.**—This Bill was read a second time.

**Boundaries of Archdeaconries and Rural Deaneries Bill and Infants' Contracts Bill.**—The Commons' amendments in these Bills were considered and agreed to.

**The Public Health (Ireland) Bill, the Police Forces Expenses Bill, and the Education Department Orders Bill.**—Passed through a committee, and were reported to the House.

**The Conveyancing and Land Transfer (Scotland) Bill.**—The report of amendments in this Bill was received.

**The Slaughter-houses, &c., Bill and the Civil Bill Courts**

(*Ireland*) Bill.—These Bills were read a third time and passed.

**The Statute Law Revision (No. 2) Bill.**—This Bill was read a third time and passed.

**Evidence Law Amendment (Scotland) Bill.**—This Bill, the objects of which are, first, to bring the law of evidence in Scotland, in cases of adultery, in unison with that of this country, and next, to provide for the recording, by means of shorthand writing, of the evidence in civil cases in the Sheriffs' Courts of Scotland was read a second time.

**The Endowed Schools Acts Amendment Bill.**—This Bill was read a first time.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

**July 24.—Assaults on Women and Children.**—In reply to a question whether a measure for the additional protection of women and children from the violence of men would be introduced by Government as soon as possible next session, Mr. Cross said the matter was under the consideration of the Government, with a view to ascertain whether any measure could be introduced with regard to it.

**Supreme Court of Judicature Act (1873) Amendment Bill.**

**Court of Judicature (Ireland) Bill.**

**Land Titles and Transfer Bill.**

**Real Property Limitation Bill.**

**Real Property Vendors and Purchasers Bill.**

Mr. DISRAELI said,—It may be convenient to the House that I should now notice the present position of public business, so that gentlemen may form some estimate of the prospect before us. For some time, unfortunately, I have seen that the Land Bills which have been introduced by her Majesty's Government for the consideration and approval of the House have but a very poor chance of being passed this session. They are, however, excellent Bills, and I trust the time is not distant when such Bills will be passed into law. There is another group of Bills which until recently I thought it was possible to pass—namely, the Judicature Bills. Her Majesty's Government were very anxious that these Bills should be passed. The delay with reference to them, no doubt, has been occasioned in a very great degree by the time occupied in the preparation of the new rules. I need not remind the House that those rules required the greatest consideration and the highest exercise of the intellect of some of the most intellectual of our fellow-subjects. No one would for a moment murmur at the time that has been expended upon the consideration of those rules. They are completely finished, and they are now before her Majesty; but, unfortunately, they could not be laid on the table of the House in time to assist us in the consideration of the Bills. Indeed, under all the circumstances, I do not think that at the end of the session, when the House is either excited or exhausted, a proper opportunity could be afforded for the discussion of arrangements which were to be irrevocable, or which, at least, must have lasted for a generation and more. Such a great question as the establishment of a court of appeal demands the whole attention of the House. I have, therefore, felt it impossible for the House this session to consider these matters.

**Endowed Schools Acts Amendment Bill.**—Mr. DISRAELI, after stating that he believed the House to be under an entire misconception of the character of many of the clauses of this Bill, but that the Bill was of such a character that upon every point to enable one to understand it the aid of experts and adepts in interpretation was needed, and that although he had devoted many anxious and perplexed hours to the attempt to understand parts of the Bill, he must confess that he had not succeeded, said that the Government proposed that, the House having sanctioned the establishment of a new commission, and the Government having completely vindicated their intention with regard to what he believed were necessary amendments in the existing law, the introduction of those amendments should be postponed to next session.

A long discussion followed, during which Mr. Barneshorn Horn claimed the fulfilment of the promise of the Government to re-introduce the dropped clauses next year, while Mr. C. Lewis said that many of the Government party objected to the interpretation put upon the Prime Minister's speech by the hon. member for the University of Cambridge. What they understood him to say was that the Government reserved the right of reviewing their intentions upon this

\* These Bills were afterwards proceeded with. See infra.

matter next session. He hoped the further consideration of the matter would not end in their placing such a strain upon the fidelity of many of their followers as would be put upon it by the revival of these clauses.

*Postponement of the Judicature Act.*—In reply to a question by Mr. WATKIN WILLIAMS, the ATTORNEY-GENERAL said the non-prosecution during the present session of the Bill for the amendment of the Judicature Act would render it essential to postpone for another twelve months the coming into operation of the Act of last year. It was intended to introduce a Bill for this purpose.—Mr. M. HENRY wished to make a suggestion to the Government respecting the Irish Judicature Bill. The judicial establishments in Ireland were greatly in excess of the requirements of the country, and a searching investigation into the matter ought to be made, but it was desirable that any Bill on the subject should be brought forward early in the session.

*Endowed Schools Acts Amendment Bill.*—In committee on this Bill,

Clauses 4, 5, 6, and 7 were omitted.

Clauses 8 and 9 were agreed to.

On the motion of Lord SANDON, clause 10 was omitted.

Clauses 11, 12, and 13 were agreed to.

On a clause, moved by Mr. EARP and afterwards withdrawn, empowering elective governing bodies and local trustees to frame schemes, Lord SANDON said it was the desire of the Government to have the assistance of local bodies in the administration of the Act, and they would hail with satisfaction the appointment of an influential committee to co-operate with them. Indeed, the Government would take the opportunity of asking the assistance of the counties in the matter. He also said that he would be the last person to pass over the claims of the great town populations.

After a discussion the preamble of the Bill was negatived. The Bill, as amended, was ordered to be reported, and the House resumed.

*Church Patronage (Scotland) Bill.*—On the Order of the Day for going into committee on this Bill, Mr. JENKINS moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is not expedient, in abolishing the existing rights of patronage in Scotland, to ignore the other Presbyterian bodies, and to legislate for the exclusive benefit of the Established Church."

After several speeches the motion was withdrawn. The House went into committee, but progress was at once reported.

*Royal (Late Indian) Ordnance Corps Compensation Bill.*—This Bill was read a second time.

*Factories (Health of Women, &c.) Bill.*—The Lords' amendments to this Bill were brought up and agreed to.

*Church Patronage (Scotland) Bill.*—The House went into committee on this Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 were agreed to.

On Clause 3, Mr. ORR EWING moved the omission of "communicants and other members of the," so as to leave the election vested in the "congregation."

The amendment was accepted, subject to the subsequent definition of congregation.—Dr. PLAYFAIR said he should move that the definition include seat holders. The amendment was agreed to.

Various other amendments were withdrawn or negatived, and progress was reported.

*The Tramways Provisional Orders Confirmation Bill.*—This Bill passed through committee.

*The Boundaries of Archdeaconries and Rural Deaneries Bill* passed through committee.

Mr. WHALLEY brought in a Bill for affording facilities for vesting in the Metropolitan Board of Works open spaces, gardens, or squares within the Metropolitan District for the exercise and recreation of the public.

*July 25.—County Court Clerks.*—Sir E. WILMOT asked the Secretary of the Treasury whether, considering that the county courts had been established nearly thirty years, and that many of the clerks had served from the opening of the courts in 1847 to the present time, he would consider the claim of the clerks of county courts to be entitled to the benefits of the Superannuation Act, 1859.—Mr. W. H. SMITH said the clerks in question were employed by the registrar of the court. They were appointed by him and were removable by him, and were not in fact servants of the Government in any way or shape. They could not, therefore, be superannuated without further legislation, as they did not come under the operation of the Act.

*Judicature Act Amendment Bill.*—Sir H. JAMES said he had learnt with great surprise, from the statement made on the previous day by the Prime Minister, that he proposed to throw over for the session that measure, as well as the Irish Judicature Bill. It was fully expected that the Judicature Act would come into operation in November next, and rules had been framed and other preparations made on that understanding. Now, however, it was proposed to postpone the coming into operation of the Act for twelve months, and although the state of "suspended animation," which would be the result, might be supposed to involve inconveniences which were more theoretical than practical, still he ventured to think that the inconveniences would be very great. Preparations, for instance, had been made with reference to altering the sittings in November, with respect to the formation of local bars, and the relations which had hitherto subsisted between the common law judges and Serjeants'-inn, and it would tend, therefore, to unsettle things very much if the operation of the Act were postponed. He saw, moreover, no reason why the pledge which had been given in 1873 should not be kept. The discussion of the Judicature Act Amendment Bill would not occupy many hours in committee, and he must express his regret that it had not been proceeded with in preference to the Scotch Patronage Bill, with regard to which no such pledge as he had mentioned had been given. In order to go on with it now, it would not be at all necessary to take up the Irish Judicature Bill, from which it might easily be disassociated, and which could be passed early next session. It appeared the Prime Minister had stated that it had been found necessary to put it off to another year, inasmuch as the rules had not been laid on the table; but on that point he thought there must be some misunderstanding; for the Bill could not depend on rules which would be to a great extent subject to its provisions and created by them. Under those circumstances he hoped the Attorney-General would proceed with the Bill.—The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said that the arrangement of the course of business did not rest with him, and that the Prime Minister had announced that it had been determined by the Government not to proceed with the Judicature Act Amendment Bill. He hoped, therefore, his hon. and learned friend would excuse him if he deferred until Monday giving a decided answer to questions and statements which he should like to have more time to consider before replying to them. He had already given notice that on that day he would move that the operation of the Judicature Act should be postponed for a year.

*Turnpike Acts Continuance Bill.*—This Bill passed through committee.

*Expiring Laws Continuance Bill.*—On the order of the day for the second reading of this Bill, Mr. SULLIVAN moved, and Sir J. GRAY seconded, the adjournment of the House.—Mr. BUTT said the Bill involved the question whether Ireland should be subject to constant coercion, as it proposed to continue coercion Acts which would otherwise expire.—The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER pointed out that the Bill would continue at least thirty Acts of which only four or five related exclusively to Ireland. In committee the Irish members would have a full opportunity of objecting to the continuance of the Acts which related to Ireland.—Mr. M. HENRY observed that when a Bill similar to the present was under discussion last year in the House of Lords the Marquis of Salisbury protested against what he called a pernicious practice, which enabled a ministry to smuggle Acts through Parliament in a heap, and Lord Carnarvon also objected to the system, because it afforded no opportunity for giving those Acts adequate consideration. Yet the Government of which they were members thought proper to continue the practice.—Sir G. BOWLER would not oppose an ordinary continuance Bill, but objected strongly to including in such a measure debateable matters such as the Irish Coercion Acts. He regarded the present Bill for that reason as irregular and unconstitutional. The House then divided. The numbers were:—

Ayes	...	...	...	...	...	...	35
Noes	...	...	...	...	...	...	114
Majority against the adjournment of the House	...	...	...	...	...	...	—79

Mr. W. H. SMITH then moved the second reading of the

**Bill.**—Captain NOLAN said that the present system of continuing expiring laws was quite a new practice. The abuse seemed to have sprung up in 1863, when for the first time a batch of expiring Acts was included in one Bill, and in following years the number so dealt with was increased. In the course of time the committee which used to consider the expediency of renewing the Acts was discontinued. What he would suggest was that in future the Acts which were not likely to give rise to any debate should be included in one Bill, and the others brought before the House in a different Bill or dealt with separately. When a Bill was passed for a limited time, there was *prima facie* reason for supposing that it might need revision. He pointed out several of the Acts included in the Bill, which, either as to the whole or as to some clauses, required alteration or consideration. A long discussion followed, during which the continuance of the coercive Acts was protested against by many Irish members. A motion for adjournment was then negatived by 110 to 35, and after a division, showing 112 for and 33 against the second reading, the Bill was read a second time.

**The Post Office Savings Bank Bill.**—This Bill was read a second time.

**The Royal (late Indian) Ordnance Corps Compensation Bill.**—This Bill passed through committee.

**The Valuation (Ireland) Act Amendment Bill.**—This Bill passed through committee.

**The Fines Act (Ireland) Amendment Bill.**—This Bill was read a second time.

**July 27.—The Tichborne Claimant.**—A petition from inhabitant's of Bradford, in favour of a free pardon to the Tichborne "Claimant," was presented by Mr. RIPLEY, and was read by the clerk at the table.—The SPEAKER was of opinion that, as the petition alleged there had not been a fair trial, it ought not to be received. The petition was rejected.

**The Judicature Bills.**—Sir H. JAMES asked whether the Government had considered the expediency of proceeding with at least one of the Judicature Bills.—Mr. DISRAELI said:—Before we came to a decision on these Bills we gave them all the consideration their importance demanded, and the opinion of her Majesty's Government was that it would not be to the public advantage to proceed with one only. They were so drawn and so fitted into each other that it would have been alike inconvenient and inexpedient to have taken such a course. From the state of public business I believe it would be quite impossible, if we looked to carry both Bills this session, that we should succeed. Some days before we arrived at this decision the Lord Chancellor had informed me it would be necessary, in consequence of the delay respecting the rules, to extend the time from the 2nd of November to the 1st of January. That was a circumstance which we took into consideration. Now, it appears to me that if these Bills are re-introduced and subjected to the advantage of a calm, and at the same time energetic and vigorous, discussion, they may be carried next year, and quite in time for the arrangements of the Summer Circuits. Therefore, we should ask for a suspension of the Bill of last year for a term not beyond November, 1875. It is probable that by May next year we shall have brought the matter to a conclusion.—Sir W. V. HARcourt inquired whether the rules would be laid on the table this session.—The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said—The Judicature Act of last session provided for the rules being laid on the table of the House after they had been made by her Majesty. As no such rules have as yet been made by her Majesty, I am unable, in accordance with the sense in which the expression is used in the Act, to lay them on the table; but appreciating the anxiety of the legal profession and of the public to become acquainted with the rules which have been prepared by the judges and submitted by them to the Lord Chancellor, I shall be happy to lay a copy of them on the table if my hon. and learned friend will move for it. After some other business had been transacted, Sir W. V. HARcourt said there might be some justification for delaying the Irish Bill, but with respect to that for Great Britain he was at a loss to understand the course the Government had taken. If the now rules were laid on the table they might pass the Bill, with the necessary alterations, through committee in a very few hours.—The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said there were five Bills among the Orders of the Day,

three of them having reference to the transfer of land, and two to the system of Judicature. As to the first three, his learned friend had not suggested that they could be proceeded with. He should rather say that Bill relating to Land Titles and Transfer, because, though there were three Bills, that one was a long Bill, which would doubtless occupy much time whenever it was gone into; and the discussion upon its second reading was very valuable, and would assist them greatly in dealing with it on a future occasion. With regard to the two other Bills, the Real Property Vendors and Purchasers Bill, and the Real Property Limitation Bill, there was no substantial opposition in the House to them, and perhaps they might possibly be carried through. They would effect a valuable improvement in the state of the law, and render it more easy to deal with the subject of land transfer. He now came to the other two Bills, with respect to Judicature. The question was whether the Act of last session should be allowed to come into operation on the 1st of November next, or should be postponed until such time as those amendments which would make it really a valuable measure were passed. If the Act of last year came into force alone, they would have the House of Lords no longer continuing as a Court of Appeal for English cases, but continuing as a Court of Appeal for Irish and Scotch cases. That, he thought, would be extremely undesirable. There was no question that the Act of last year was passed on the faith that before it was brought into operation another Bill would be passed which would enable the appellate jurisdiction in Scotch and Irish cases to be removed from the House of Lords to the Imperial Court of Appeal. His hon. and learned friend suggested that they could strike out of the Judicature Bill the reference to Scotland and Ireland; but if they did they would have the Judicature Act of last session coming into force, abolishing the House of Lords as a Court of Appeal for English cases, but leaving it still a Court of Appeal for Scotch and Irish cases. The House was aware that the present Bill, as far as regarded the removal of the appellate jurisdiction of the House of Lords in Irish matters was opposed by a large number of the Irish representatives. Again, was it desirable to carry that portion of the amendment of their system of judicature which would create a new Court of Appeal as far as regarded Irish cases when they were not able to proceed with the other Judicature Bill, the effect of which would be to re-arrange and improve the whole system of judicature in Ireland? He thought the whole scheme ought to go together, and that there would be no chance of their passing this session the second of those measures, the Court of Judicature (Ireland) Bill. Therefore, because it was not desirable to alter the Ultimate Court of Appeal as far as Ireland was concerned unless they also altered the whole form of procedure in Ireland, and likewise because it was not desirable to bring the new appellate tribunal into operation as far as regarded England until it was also brought into operation for Scotland and Ireland—on either of those grounds it was unadvisable to proceed with the Bill to which his hon. and learned friend particularly referred.—Sir H. JAMES expressed his opinion that the ATTORNEY-GENERAL's explanation of the course of the Government in reference to the Judicature Act and the Amendment Bills was very unsatisfactory. There would be ample time to pass the Bill by the 10th or 12th of August if the question as it affected Ireland was postponed until next session.—The ATTORNEY-GENERAL for IRELAND contended that the last suggestion of the hon. and learned gentleman could not be carried out. The Bill was not intended to amend the Act of last year, but to constitute one Imperial Court for the three kingdoms, and it was of great importance that that Court should be constituted by one Bill, and not by separate measures. He, therefore, altogether objected to the proposal, that the clauses relating to Ireland should be omitted from the Bill. He could not assent to the suggestion that a Bill relating to this country should be passed even with the undertaking that it should be afterwards extended to Ireland and Scotland. When the Government came to appoint the judges of the Imperial Court they must be influenced by the consideration whether appeals from Ireland and Scotland were to be disposed of by it. They could not proceed with the Bill, therefore, under the idea that it was one in which the Irish members had no interest. After a few other short speeches the House went into committee of supply.

*Land Titles and Transfer Bill.*—On the motion of the Attorney-General, the order for going into committee was discharged and the Bill withdrawn.

*Real Property Vendors and Purchasers Bill.*—This Bill went through committee, and was reported as amended.

*Real Property Limitation Bill.*—On the motion of the Attorney-General that the House go into committee Mr. Butt said he believed the Bill extended to Ireland.—The ATTORNEY-GENERAL replied in the affirmative. The Bill then passed through committee.

*Registration of Births and Deaths Bill.*—A clause was added to this Bill, and the report of amendments was then agreed to.

*Vaccination Act, 1871, Amendment Bill.*—This Bill was read the second time.

*The Endowed Schools Act Amendment Bill.*—This Bill as amended was considered.

*The Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill.*—This Bill was withdrawn.

*The Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation Bill.*—This Bill passed through committee.

*Church Patronage (Scotland) Bill.*—In committee on this Bill, clause 4 was agreed to after some amendments therein had been negatived.

Clauses 5 and 6 were amended and agreed to.

On Clause 7, an amendment was carried the effect of which was that in parishes where there were less than twenty-five communicants, the power of presentation by the Presbytery should be suspended until rules were made by the General Assembly on the subject.

Clause 7 as amended was agreed to.

Clauses 8 and 9 were also agreed to.

On the preamble, a motion to insert words to show that the object of the Bill was to promote union among the Presbyterians of Scotland was negatived. The Bill then passed through committee.

*July 28.—The Brussels Conference.*—In reply to a question Mr. DISRAELI said that having received satisfactory communications from the Powers the Government had instructed General Horsford to attend the Conference.

*Adulteration of Food Act.*—In reply to a question Mr. Cross said he did not think it was competent to the Home Secretary to issue a circular to magistrates instructing them that they should be specially careful as to the way in which they carried out the law on this subject as long as that law existed. But he trusted that having regard to the report of the Select Committee the local authorities would be extremely careful in instituting prosecutions until an opportunity had been afforded for legislation.

*Public Worship Regulation Bill.*—Various amendments were made in this Bill, which then passed through committee.—Mr. DISRAELI gave notice that on the report, which was fixed for Friday, he would bring up a clause to provide for the salary of the judge.

*The Royal Irish Constabulary and Dublin Metropolitan Police Bill.*—This Bill passed through committee.

*The Registration of Births and Deaths Bill.*—This Bill was read a third time and passed.

*The Vaccination Act (1871) Amendment Bill.*—This Bill passed through committee.

*The Turnpike Act Continuance Bill.*—This Bill was read a third time and passed.

*The Valuation (Ireland) Act Amendment Bill.*—This Bill was read a third time and passed.

*July 29.—Public Worship Regulation Bill.*—In committee on this Bill the House, by a majority of 74 against a minority of 42, agreed to a proposal made on behalf of the Government, that for a period, not exceeding three years, a sum not exceeding £3,000 a year should be charged to the Consolidated Fund for the purpose of paying the judge's salary, and that at the same time certain moneys arising from fees, or available in consequence of the extinction of offices now existing, should be put to the credit of the Consolidated Fund.—Mr. DISRAELI explained that the object of the Government was, by providing in the meantime for the salary of the judge, to allow a certain time for the making of arrangements at present in contemplation, by which the office would be made self-sustaining. He hoped that long before three years had elapsed these arrangements would have been effected and the Consolidated Fund would have been freed from the charge; but if it should be otherwise, there would be placed to the

credit of the Consolidated Fund during these three years the various sums arising from the sources he had mentioned.

*Indian Councils Bill.*—Lord G. HAMILTON, in moving the second reading of this Bill, explained that its object was to appoint on the Council of the Governor-General of India one member who should be responsible for the Public Works Department. After a debate the House divided, and the second reading was carried by 171 to 52.

*Regimental Exchanges Bill.*—This Bill was withdrawn.

The following Bills passed through committee:—Elementary Educational Orders Confirmation Bill, Great Seal Offices Bill, Post Office Savings Bank Bill, and Fines Act (Ireland) Amendment Bill.

*The Foyle College Bill and the Pier and Harbour Orders Confirmation Bill.* were read a third time and passed.

*The Vaccination Act (1871) Amendment Bill.* as amended, was considered, and the Bill was read a third time and passed.

An amendment of the Lords in the *Rating Bill* was considered and agreed to.

*July 30.—Houses of the Labouring Classes.*—Mr. CROSS moved and the House agreed to a series of Resolutions with reference to private Bills by which power was sought to obtain possession of houses occupied by members of the labouring classes. The resolutions were as follows:—

"In the case of any Bill by which power is sought to take, in any city, town, or parish, 15 houses or more, occupied either wholly or partially, as tenants or lodgers, by persons belonging to the labouring classes, the promoters be required to deposit in the Private Bill Office, on or before the 31st day of December, a statement of the number, description, and situation of the said houses, the number (so far as they can be ascertained) of persons to be displaced, and whether any and what provision is made in the Bill for remedying the inconvenience likely to arise from such displacement, and that such statement be referred to the committee on the Bill."

"In every Bill by which power is sought to take, in any city, town, or parish, 15 houses or more occupied either wholly or partially as tenants or lodgers, by persons belonging to the labouring classes, a clause shall be inserted to enact that the company shall, not less than eight weeks before taking any such houses, make known their intention to take the same by placards, handbills, or other general notice placed in public view upon or within a reasonable distance from such houses, and that the company shall not take any such houses until they have obtained the certificate of a justice in England and Ireland, and of the sheriff in Scotland, that it has been proved to his satisfaction that the company have made known their intention to take the same in manner required by this provision."

"In every such Bill a clause shall be inserted, if applicable, requiring the promoters to procure, within a time to be limited, sufficient accommodation for persons belonging to the labouring classes who will be displaced under the powers of the Bill."

"The committee upon every such Bill shall report specially to the House—1. whether such a clause has been inserted in the Bill; and, if not, the grounds upon which the committee have decided it to be inapplicable. 2. The several circumstances affecting the displacement of persons by the operation of the Bill, and the means by which other accommodation is to be provided for the persons to be removed. That these orders be standing orders of the House."

*Irish Judicial System.*—In reply to a question Mr. DISRAELI said that the Government had not had the opportunity of considering the course they would pursue with regard to the vacant judicial offices in Ireland, but it was a subject which would engage their immediate attention. In reply to a question whether before introducing another Judicature Bill for Ireland the Government would consider the propriety of issuing a Royal Commission on the subject, Mr. DISRAELI said his attention had been called to the matter, but it was not the intention of Government to recommend her Majesty to issue a Royal Commission on the subject, because in case legislation was required, all the information necessary was before the House.

*Public Worship Regulation (Consolidated Fund, &c.) Bill.*—The report of the Public Worship Regulation (Consolidated Fund, &c.) Bill was agreed to.

*Endowed Schools Acts Amendment Bill.*—This Bill was read a third time and passed.

*Espiring Laws Continuance Bill.*—After a long debate the House went into committee on this Bill. Various amendments were made in the Bill and the schedule, and the Bill passed through committee.

The *Real Property Vendors and Purchasers Bill* passed through committee, and was read a third time and passed.

The *Real Property Limitation Bill* was read a third time and passed.

The *Elementary Education Provisional Orders Confirmation Bill* was read a third time and passed.

The *Private Lunatic Asylums (Ireland) Bill* was read a second time.

## SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS.

### INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

The annual general meeting of the Incorporated Law Society, was held at the Society's Hall, Chancery-lane, on Friday the 24th ult., F. H. JANSON, Esq., President, in the chair.

Mr. E. W. WILLIAMSON (Secretary), having read the circular convening the meeting, and the minutes of previous general meetings having been taken as read, the meeting proceeded to the election of the president and vice-president and auditors of the society for the ensuing year, when Mr. F. T. Bircham was elected president, Mr. G. B. Gregory, M.P., vice-president, and Mr. Roberts, Mr. Mackeson, and Mr. Graham, auditors.

Mr. MACARTHUR then rose for the purpose of nominating Mr. Thomas Henry Bolton as a member of the Council in place of the late Mr. John Henry Bolton.

The CHAIRMAN said that by this nomination there were more candidates than there were vacancies, and unless the proposer and seconder would withdraw it there must be a ballot, as Mr. Richard Boyer had been nominated for the same vacancy.

Mr. CLABON wished it to be known that at the last election Mr. Boyer had the same number of votes as Mr. Jeavons, and that by the casting vote of the chairman Mr. Jeavons had been elected. He thought this was a reason for asking that Mr. Boyer might be elected on the present occasion.

Mr. SHIRLEY also thought Mr. Boyer should be elected, and strongly urged his claims in opposition to those of Mr. Macarthur's candidate.

Mr. MACARTHUR declined to withdraw his nomination, and urged that if it were desired to save the trouble and expense of a ballot, one of the other candidates who had already sat on the Council should withdraw. He would not withdraw his candidate, but hoped to bring him in triumphantly.

The CHAIRMAN, therefore, appointed Mr. Longbourne, Mr. Fraser, Mr. P. Roberts, Mr. Masterman, and Mr. Bromhead to act as scrutineers, and stated that the meeting would stand adjourned to the 17th of August, at two o'clock, for the purpose of receiving their report.

It was then moved and seconded that the annual report which had been circulated among the members of the society should be received and entered on the minutes.\*

Mr. GRESHAM referred to that portion of the report which stated what had been done by the Council with regard to the Inns of Court and School of Law Bill, and wished to know whether any communication had been made to the benchers of the Inns of Court upon the subject. He had been a member of Gray's-inn for the last thirty years, and thought it a great privilege, and one of which attorneys ought not to be deprived, and which they ought to persist in endeavouring to obtain. During the last five years there had only been seventeen members called, although the annual income, according to the report of the Royal Commission in 1855, was £8,313 4s. 8d. Taking the five years that these calls reached over, they would find that £41,716 3s. 4d. had been expended in the call of seventeen gentlemen. One of these gentlemen was a hop merchant and another a wine merchant. It was time something more should be known of the matter, and he asked whether there was any information to be afforded by the society with respect to it, or whether the time had not

yet arrived when the Council could, in their official capacity, supply it.

Mr. BOLTON was also a member of Gray's-inn, but, unfortunately for himself, he had been admitted a member many years after Mr. Gresham, and was therefore not permitted to participate in certain advantages which Mr. Gresham enjoyed. He wished to suggest to the Council the desirability of taking the matter up. It was an innovation to exclude attorneys from membership, and it was only recently—namely, in the case of Mr. Gresham's son—that a judicial decision had been arrived at with reference to it. Until this decision was announced attorneys were allowed to become members on sufferance; now they were altogether prevented from becoming members. The inn was almost entirely supported by attorneys, and they therefore had peculiar claims upon it, and if they could be admitted to the inns it would form an easy method by means of which those who were ambitious for the position might go to the bar.

The CHAIRMAN, in answer to Mr. Gresham's inquiry, said that the report contained the whole story of what the Council had done, and they had nothing to add to it.

Mr. BOLTON desired to say a word or two with regard to other matters mentioned in the report. With reference to the Judicature Act, he wished to know whether the Council had taken any measures with the view of getting a revision of the scale of remuneration at present allowed to attorneys, which was very inadequate. Referring to the County Courts Bill, county courts had become very important, and it was essential that the remuneration there should be adequate to the work done. The allowance made it scarcely worth a practitioner's while to have anything to do with them, and for his part he abstained from going into county courts for the simple reason that the expenses out of pocket were so heavy and the remuneration was so small. The County Courts Bill afforded a favourable opportunity for the Council to interfere in the matter. With reference to the Legal Practitioners Bill, he asked what action the Council had taken to support the two gentlemen who had brought the matter forward, and what steps to counteract the mischievous speech of the Solicitor-General, a speech which was most unfair to solicitors, and one which he felt sure the Solicitor-General would regret. With regard to the usages of the profession, which formed one heading of the report, he suggested that the Council should inform the members the nature of the decisions they had arrived at. He also wished to suggest to the Council the desirability of increasing the number of members of the society, and that some active steps should be taken with this object in view. Attorneys and solicitors ought to form a very powerful and influential body in the State; but they were so split up and so timidly led, that they did not assert their just rights. They could only maintain these by strengthening their Parliamentary influence. He thought that when a solicitor of good standing put himself forward as a candidate for a seat in Parliament it should be the duty of the Council to exert themselves to support his candidature. Other bodies acted in this way, and why should not they do the same? If a large portion of the mass of solicitors were members of the society, there would then be an agent in every town in England and in every district in London who could use his influence with the member of Parliament representing that constituency.

Mr. MASTERMAN felt that Mr. Gresham had a real grievance. It was manifest that the bar had been acquiring everything to the exclusion of solicitors. He believed that Lord Selborne's Bill had been introduced into the Upper House of Parliament, and that it would be printed and published, and he urged solicitors to make themselves acquainted with it during the long vacation, for he believed that no one was more ready to listen to any suggestions upon the subject than Lord Selborne, and the present Lord Chancellor seemed inclined to shake hands with his Lordship with respect to the matter. Clifford's-inn originally belonged to solicitors in Chancery, but this too had passed from them.

Mr. KEEN thought it was only justice to the Council to mention that he knew of some very good work they had done, for which they had not taken any credit, and which did not appear in their report. It was with regard to the Court of Arches. He had brought before the Council the

\* For this report see ante, p. 714.

anomaly of solicitors being excluded from the Court of Arches, and the fact that they can go into the Court of First Instance, and that they must go out again and come in in the Court of Appeal. There were very few proctors, and the choice was therefore limited. The Council immediately prepared the draft of a bill to remedy this, and they saw the Attorney-General and put the matter forward, when up started the Public Worship Regulation Bill, and the Council prepared a clause in less than no time for insertion in the Bill. There were in Doctors'-commons, as the meeting well knew, some very valuable appointments. The first was that of the Queen's Proctor, and they must bear in mind that proctors were made solicitors, and not barristers. The present holder was a gentleman of advanced age; the office must therefore before long become vacant; and there was a rumour current that when this happened it would be made a branch of the Treasury with a Queen's counsel or a barrister of ten years' standing at the head of it. Now the work was purely that of a practitioner, and whilst he had no objection to its being made a Government office he thought a solicitor of high standing best fitted to occupy the post. If solicitors put up with this system they would soon have an act of Parliament providing that wherever there was a firm of solicitors with a good business a barrister should be placed at the head of the firm, and the junior partners, the solicitors, should do all the work. He also understood that when the Admiralty Proctor's office was vacant that would go to the bar unless solicitors bestirred themselves to prevent it. If this danger came upon them he thought that a memorial or protest should emanate from the Council and be signed by every individual member of the society. He did not think such a document as this would be treated with contempt.

Mr. MUNTON called attention to the increasing number of solicitors whose names appeared in the Bankruptcy Gazette. He thought this was a matter for the consideration of the Council, and that something in the shape of a vigilance committee should be formed for the purpose of watching it. The fact of a solicitor being a bankrupt ought to be a *prima facie* reason why he should not be a member of the society unless the Council were satisfied that his bankruptcy had not arisen from any unfair cause.

Mr. SHIRLEY thought that the interest of solicitors was to keep the two branches of the profession distinct from one another, because whilst there were not many solicitors who wished to act as barristers, there were many barristers who would be only too glad to do solicitors' work. He read an extract from a former report of the Council to the effect that every gentleman intending to practise as a solicitor should pass through a course of training as an articled clerk and should pass an examination; and also an extract from a paper read at a meeting at Leeds of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, suggesting that the choice of the branch of the profession to which a student shall devote himself should be made after and not before the end of the period of study, and he thought, considering the emolument which comes to solicitors in premiums for articles which would go to barristers if articles were abolished, such a suggestion must be a sign of the opinion of that branch of the profession. It would be very unwise to break down the barrier, because if the transit from solicitors' practice to the bar were made easy it must also be made easy for the barrister to become a solicitor.

Mr. KIMBER thought the Council should have said something in their report with regard to the vacation. The Judicature Act had passed through Parliament, and not a word had been said as to the Taxing Office in Chancery being open during the vacation. Great injustice would be caused by its closing. The Court of Chancery pronounced a judgment, and then by reason of the Taxing Master's Office being closed nothing could be done until November, and he protested against this in the name of the profession, and in the name of justice. With regard to the Inns of Court he quite agreed with Mr. Gresham. The property of these Inns was granted for the benefit of students and professors of the law, and yet solicitors were excluded from them. In their report the Council stated that they were of opinion that solicitors, in order to be members of the General School of Law, should also have been members of the society for a stated period. He was

opposed to this as it was putting class above class, and the press would say "you are legislating in favour of your own class."

Mr. THOMAS drew the attention of the meeting to the enormously increasing amount of county court business, and the total inadequacy of the fees paid for the same, of which he gave instances. He was a member of Clifford's Inn and thought it a great privilege.

Mr. BROMHEAD thought the members must congratulate themselves on the union of the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association with the Incorporated Law Society, which would tend to increase the number of country members. He had been in conversation with a very important member of the House of Commons who had said, "I consider the institution in Chancery-lane the most powerful association in this country," but he (Mr. Bromhead) doubted the accuracy of his opinion. He saw no reason why the institution should not be very powerful, and he thought they had taken the first step towards this by bringing about the union of the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association with the society. The larger the number of country members the greater would be the influence they could bring to bear on members of Parliament. It might not be within their knowledge that the member for Coventry had given notice of an amendment on the subject of costs between party and party which ran something like this, "that in future the costs between party and party shall mean such costs as are now usually allowed between solicitor and client where they are paid out of a fund in court." The motion had been approved by a number of important members of Parliament, and ought to meet the unanimous support of the members of the profession generally.

Mr. LONGBOURNE was afraid that as long as the admission fee of town members who had taken out their first certificates more than five years previously stood at £5, and of country members at £2, the majority of the profession would not be induced to become members. He suggested that the admission fee should be abolished.

Mr. HILL wished to know what had been done with reference to the Land Transfer Bill. The Bill would produce a revolution in the profession, and he very much regretted that it had been allowed to pass without protest. Mr. Hill censured the Council for their want of energy in opposing it. The Bill would put clients to great expense. He would like to move that the paragraph of the report referring to this subject be sent back to the Council with an intimation that the members would like to know how many sittings they had had for the consideration of it, and what influence they had exercised to prevent the Bill passing.

Mr. BATH was surprised that so little reference had been made to the Bill in the report, and would be glad to have more information on the subject.

Mr. RYLAND said that with regard to the subject of usages of the profession, very important questions were constantly brought before the Council under this title, and upon these certain decisions were given. These decisions were only known to the parties interested, but he hoped the day would come when they would be made known to the profession, and thereby a nearer approach to uniformity of practice might be obtained. He suggested that this might be done at the annual provincial meetings.

The CHAIRMAN, before putting the motion to the meeting, would refer to the points mentioned by the previous speakers. With respect to the revised scale of costs under the new Judicature Act, he might state that it was receiving the anxious consideration of the Council, and a Committee had been appointed on whom the work would more particularly devolve, and who would have the opportunity of communicating with those to whom the framing of the scale had been entrusted. As regards the Legal Practitioners Bill, he thought the member who spoke upon this subject was hardly aware that the Bill had been very much altered since it was first brought into Parliament. The important clauses affecting the profession had been embodied in the Attorneys and Solicitors Acts Amendment Bill, which was likely to pass this session, while the Legal Practitioners Bill was not. No members of the society could be more anxious for an increase of members than the Council were, and successive Presidents had used their influence for this object with

considerable success, but the Council could do little unless supported by the members of the profession in their different localities. He was surprised at the objection taken by Mr. Kimber to the qualification proposed by the Council, and introduced into the School of Law Bill. It was thought that nothing was so likely to lead to the increase of the members of the society as giving them a special privilege, such as that proposed. With regard to vacations it must be well known to all present that the Judicature Act had abolished terms and with terms vacations. The question of vacations would no doubt be dealt with by rules, and until these were promulgated it was premature to charge the Council with want of action concerning the matter. The Land Transfer Bill had received great attention from the Council. He was not prepared to state how many sittings they had had with regard to it, but many of their sittings had been prolonged to a late hour. Mr. Hill seemed to think that the Bill must necessarily be regarded by the whole profession as altogether erroneous in principle and likely to be baneful in its working. He believed the contrary to be the fact. The profession were much divided in opinion with regard to this, and this had made the labour of the Council more arduous, and it must not be forgotten that their influence with the members of the Legislature was but limited. Only within the last few days had they sent out fresh circulars to the provincial law societies, calling upon them to do their best to induce members of Parliament to support the motion, of which Mr. Osborne Morgan had given notice, to prevent the Bill from passing this session unless it had been well considered in committee.

The motion that the report be approved and entered on the minutes was then put and carried *nem. dis.*

Mr. CROWDER rose to propose some motions of which he had given notice, and which had been circulated amongst the members, to the effect that it is desirable in the interest of the society that all elections which may hereafter take place, for the purpose of filling up vacancies in the Council, should be conducted without any circulation by the Council of selected lists of candidates (see 17 S. J. 823). He said that the circumstances under which the motions were brought forward were that prior to the annual general meeting last year a circular with the names of selected candidates had appeared, purporting to be sent out with the authority of the Council, and shortly afterwards a duly authenticated circular was sent out by the Council, containing a list of the candidates they would prefer to see elected. The circular stated that the former circular had not the consent of the Council, and whilst expressing the determination of the Council not to take any part in the election of candidates, they nevertheless took that opportunity of mentioning the names of the gentlemen they would like to see at their board. If the Council were to take joint action in these matters it was impossible that such a number of gentlemen could select the candidates without some difference of opinion as to those who should be approved; and it was therefore an undesirable system. Another objection was that if one of the Council's candidates was not elected, the gentleman elected in his place could not possibly be received with cordiality at the board: it was not in human nature.

The CHAIRMAN believed the resolution expressed the feelings of the Council entirely, and that except under very peculiar circumstances, such as existed when the circular was sent out, such a step would not be taken. It was not taken then but with considerable hesitation and reluctance.

Mr. KIMBER wished to know whether they were to understand that the Council did not intend to send out such a circular again.

The CHAIRMAN said the Council had not intended to circulate it at all, but were driven to it by the sending out of the previous circular, which was calculated to mislead.

A member asked for a definite assurance on the part of the Council that such a circular would not again be sent out.

The CHAIRMAN said the Council could give no such assurance.

Mr. SHIRLEY could not support the abstract proposition contained in the motion. He thought there was a good deal to be said on the part of the Council. He had been deceived by the first circular, thinking it emanated from the Council, as it was headed "Incorporated Law Society."

You could not bind a country law society or an association of members not to send out a circular, and you must not, therefore, tie the hands of the Council.

Mr. BOLTON understood that it was not the intention of the Council to attempt to influence the election, and he hoped it would be satisfactory that the matter should be allowed to rest on that assurance.

Mr. CROWDER then withdrew his motion.

Mr. RIPLEY rose to propose a series of resolutions of which he had given notice, but his language was very vehement, and the meeting desiring the adjournment of the matter, and Mr. Ripley stating that he had no objection to an adjournment.

Mr. FORD moved that the consideration of the matter be adjourned to some day in July, 1875, to be appointed by the president. The motion was duly seconded and carried unanimously, and the proceedings terminated with a vote of thanks to the chairman.

The following is the notice of motion referred to in the above report:—

NOTICE RECEIVED ON THE 26TH OF JUNE, 1874.

To the Secretary of the Law Institution, Chancery Lane.  
Be pleased to take notice that at the ensuing annual meeting I intend to move the following amendments in the bye-laws, namely:—

In reference to the 8th bye-law, as to the annual or special general meetings (the Council consisting of 50 members), 50 shall be substituted for 20 as forming a quorum.

In reference to the 11th bye-law, that instead of the following item, which appears in the 48th report of the account of the auditors, namely, "salaries to officers, clerks, servants, &c., £3,318 4s." that the auditors be directed and required to specify and state separately and apart, in separate items, the amount of the annuity paid to the widow of the deceased secretary, the salaries and allowances (from whatever fund) paid or received by the present secretary, and the amount of salary, lodgings, and perquisites paid or furnished to each clerk employed by the Council, as being either in their service or in the service of the society.

And that instead of the item in such report, namely, "examination, registration, and law class expenses, £1,206. 3s." that the auditors be directed and required to specify and state what part of that sum is paid to the steward of the law club, in respect of the expenses of the Council or in respect of dinners given by the Council, either in their name or in the name of the society, or otherwise in respect of the Council.

That the 13th bye-law be abrogated and annulled, and struck out of the bye-laws.

That the 27th bye-law be abrogated and annulled, and struck out of the bye-laws.

That so much of the 30th bye-law as requires the candidate or candidates therein mentioned or referred to, to sign the nominations of himself or themselves, be struck out and expunged from that bye-law.

That the 42nd bye-law be abrogated and annulled, and struck out of the bye-laws.

That the 44th bye-law, which provides that the Council shall have the custody of the common seal of the society, be amended by providing, instead of the further provision as to the common seal therein contained, that the common seal shall not be affixed to any instrument until a meeting of the society shall have been called, and a resolution of the society passed at such meeting, authorising the affixing of the common seal of the society to such instruments.

I intend also to submit the following resolution to such meeting:—

That the purposes, objects and intentions of the founders of the society were wholly lost sight of by the committee of management, under the first charter, and that there was gross and shameful abuse in the Chancery compensations to the late sword clerks, which compensations were got up by the late Mr. Foss in the name of the committee, he at that time having taken his name off the rolls, both of attorneys and solicitors, and being thereby disqualified to be upon the committee of management two years previously, and yet subsequently permitted by the committee of management to act as chairman and deputy-chairman of that committee.

I intend further to submit to the meeting correspondence with Mr. Ouvry, in reference to the club ballot, submitted with the charters to counsel, and the subsequent opinion given by counsel, that under the existing charters of the

society there can be no club with a ballot against any members of the society, and to state that not being now a member of the club I tendered myself for ejection from the club, so that the legality or illegality of the club with a ballot might be tried at law, and that the club committee declined to eject me, and subsequent correspondence with certain members of the club and Council, and with the secretary, in reference thereto, and that the trial of an action at law was delayed and ultimately avoided.—Yours obediently,

W. R. RIFLEY.  
43, Lincoln's Inn Fields.

#### SOCIAL SCIENCE CONGRESS.

The appointment of officers and the arrangement of questions for discussion in the department of Jurisprudence and the Amendment of the Law of the Social Science Congress to be held at Glasgow are now complete. Lord Moncrieff (Lord Justice Clerk) will preside over the department, and the following will be Vice-Presidents of the Municipal Law Section:—The Right Hon. Edward S. Gordon, M.P.; Lord Advocate of Scotland; The Hon. Lord Gifford; Joseph Brown, Esq., Q.C.; Charles Clark, Esq., Q.C.; W. T. S. Daniel, Esq., Q.C.; Sheriff Dickson, Esq., LL.D.; Joseph Dodds, Esq., M.P.; W. Neilson Hancock, Esq., LL.D.; D. C. Heron, Esq., Q.C.; A. E. Miller, Esq., Q.C.; Adam Paterson, Esq., LL.D.; Professor Robertson, LL.D.; Sir Travers Twiss, Q.C., D.C.L., F.R.S.; Alfred Waddilove, Esq., D.C.L.; Thomas Webster, Esq., Q.C., F.R.S.

The special questions for discussion in the section are:—  
1. Is it desirable that the verdicts of juries should be unanimous? 2. Should the testimony of any and what persons, at present excluded witnesses, be admissible as evidence in courts of law? 3. How far may courts of arbitration be resorted to as a means of settling the disputes of nations?

In the Repression of Crime Section, Frederic Hill, Esq., will act as Chairman, assisted by the following Vice-Presidents:—T. B. Ll. Baker, Esq.; Sheriff Barclay, of Perth; John Hill Burton, Esq., LL.D.; Rutherford Clark, Esq., Dean of Faculty of Advocates; Lord Craighill; Mr. Sergeant Cox; R. T. Middleton, Esq.; Mr. Sergeant Pulling; H. B. Sheridan, Esq., M.P.; Mark J. Stewart, Esq., M.P.

The special questions framed for this section are as follows:—1. How far is it desirable that the Industrial Schools Act should be extended to day industrial feeding schools? 2. How far should previous convictions be taken into account in sentencing criminals? 3. Is it desirable to extend sentences of police supervision to other cases than those already provided for?

Papers on other subjects than the above, coming within the scope of the department, will be read and discussed.

#### OBITUARY.

##### THE RIGHT HONOURABLE ABRAHAM BREWSTER.

This ex-Lord Chancellor of Ireland, whose death was announced at the beginning of this week, was born in 1796. He was called to the Irish bar in 1819, and received a silk gown in 1835. Having served the offices of Solicitor-General and Attorney-General for Ireland, he resumed in 1855 his former private position at the bar, which he left in 1866, when he was appointed Lord Justice. In 1867 he became Lord Chancellor of Ireland. His reputation as an advocate greatly exceeded that which he acquired on the bench.

##### SIR CHARLES R. M. JACKSON.

Sir Charles R. M. Jackson, who died on the 21st July at Tunbridge Wells, was a son of the late Lieutenant-General Alexander C. Jackson, of Dawlish, Devonshire. He was born in 1813, and was called to the bar at Lincoln's Inn in 1836, and practised as an equity draughtsman and conveyancer. In 1848 he was appointed Advocate-General at Bengal, and promoted to the bench in 1852 as a judge of the Supreme Court at Bombay. In 1855 he was transferred to the Supreme Court at Calcutta, and in 1859 he was sworn a member of the Legislative Council of India. He received a fresh appointment under the new Act as

judge of the High Court of Judicature in 1862, from which office he retired on a pension about ten years ago. Returning to England, he lived for some years at Brighton, and at one time took an active part in the affairs of the London and Brighton Railway. He also acted as president of the Bombay Bank Commission.

##### MR. W. D. CHRISTIE, C.B.

Mr. W. Dougal Christie, formerly Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Emperor of Brazil, was born in 1815, and was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in 1840. He sat for Weymouth in 1841; and since his return from Brazil in 1863 he unsuccessfully contested the representation of several boroughs. He was well known in diplomatic and literary circles. He died on the 27th of last month.

#### TWO LEGAL CURIOSITIES.

"About the year 1632," says Webster in his work on Witchcraft, "near unto Chester in the street, there lived one Walker, a yeoman of good estate and a widower, who had a young woman to his kinswoman that kept his house, who was by the neighbours suspected of indiscretion, and was toward the dark of the evening one night sent away with one Mark Sharp, who was a collier, or one that digged coals under ground, and one that had been born in Blakeburn Hundred, in Lancashire; and so she was not heard of a long time, and no noise, or little, was made about it. In the winter time one James Grahame, or Grime (for so in that country they called them), being a miller, and living about two miles from the place where Walker lived, was one night alone very late in the mill grinding corn, and about twelve or one o'clock at night he came down the stairs from having been putting corn in the hopper; the mill doors being shut, there stood a woman upon the midst of the floor, with her hair about her head hanging down, and all bloody, with five large wounds upon her head. He being much affrighted and amazed began to bless himself, and at last asked her who she was and what she wanted? To which she said: I am a spirit of such a woman, who lived with Walker, and being seduced by him, he promised to send me to a private place, where I should be well looked to, until I could come again and keep his house. And accordingly, said the apparition, I was one night late sent away with one Mark Sharp, who upon a moor, naming a place that the miller knew, slew me with a pick such as men dig coal with, and gave me these five wounds, and after threw my body into a coal pit hard by, and hid the pick under a bank; and his stockings and shoes being bloody, he endeavoured to wash 'em, but seeing the blood would not forth, he hid them there. And the apparition further told the miller that he must be the man to reveal it, or else she must still appear and haunt him. The miller returned home very sad and heavy, but spoke not one word of what he had seen, but eschewed as much as he could to stay in the mill at night without company, thinking thereby to escape the seeing again of that frightful apparition. But notwithstanding, one night when it began to be dark, the apparition met him again, and seemed very fierce and cruel, and threatened him that if he did not reveal the murder, she would continually pursue and haunt him; yet for all this he concealed it till St. Thomas' eve before Christmas, when, being soon after sunset walking in his garden, she appeared again, and then so threatened him and affrighted him, that he faithfully promised to reveal it next morning. In the morning he went to a magistrate, and made the whole matter known, with all the circumstances; and diligent search being made, the body was found in a coal pit, with the five wounds in the head, and the pick and the shoes and stockings yet bloody, in every circumstance as the apparition had related to the miller; whereupon Walker and Mark Sharp were both apprehended, but would confess nothing. At the following assizes, I think it was at Durham, they were arraigned, found guilty, condemned, and executed."

This story is not only related by Webster, who says he saw the letter of the judge before whom the case was tried, to Sergeant Hutton, in Yorkshire, in which he relates the whole affair, but Dr. Henry More also not only mentions this singular circumstance, but communicated it to Dr.

Glenvil, with the additional testimony of Mr. Shepherdson, and of Mr. Lumley, of Lumley, an ancient gentleman, who knew all the parties well, and was at the trial. Mr. James Smart, also of the city of Durham, was at the trial, where a Mr. P. rhain gave it in evidence, upon oath, that he saw the likeness of the child stand upon Walker's shoulders during the time of the trial! From the evidence of these parties, it appears that the name of the girl was Annie Walker; that the judge Davenport, who was so much troubled on the trial that he gave sentence the same night, a thing never done before or afterwards in Durham; and Surtees adds that the deposition of Grime, the miller, is deposited in the Bodleian Library, in Tanner's MSS. The parties represent the affair as well known to hundreds, and more talked about in that neighbourhood in those days than any other thing ever was, and that this determined apparition not only persecuted Grime in his mill, but in his house night by night, dragging the clothes off his bed, and giving him no peace until he gave information of the murder, so that well might Master Webster declare it to be "one of those apparitions and strange accidents which cannot be solved by the supposed principles of matter and motion, but which do evidently require some other cause above or different from the ordinary course of nature, effects that do strangely exceed the power of natural causes, and may for ever convince all atheistical minds." The oddest thing of all in this strange story is, that nobody seemed to have the slightest suspicion that Grime, the miller, himself might possibly be the real murderer, and had trumped up this story of a ghost to turn all idea of the fact from himself, and probably upon those to whom he entertained a hatred. The condemned parties steadily to the last persisted in their innocence, and it was entirely on the evidence of Grime and his ghost that they were arrested, tried, and executed.

One of the most remarkable facts in the history of highwaymen, who, a century ago, played a bold and very prominent part on the roads around London for a dozen miles or so, is a bill filed in the Court of Exchequer by William Wreathock, of Hatton Garden, attorney, between John Everett and Joseph Williams, two notorious robbers, the former of whom was afterward executed at Tyburn, and the latter at Maidstone, in Kent; for which insult and affront on the court Wreathock was committed prisoner to the Fleet, where he remained six months. The bill opens as follows:—"Humbly complaining, sheweth unto your honours, your orator, John Everett, of the parish of St. James, Clerkenwell, in the county of Middlesex, gent., debtor and accountant to her Majesty, as by the record of this honourable court it doth appear, that your orator being skilled in dealing and in buying and selling several sorts of commodities, such as corn, hay, straw, horses, cows, sheep, oxen, hogs, wool, lambs, butter, cheese, plate, rings, watches, canes, swords, and other commodities, whereby your orator had acquired to himself a very considerable sum of money, to the amount of £1,000 and upward; and Joseph Williams, of the parish of —, in the said county of Middlesex, gent., being acquainted therewith, and knowing your orator's great care, diligence and industry, in managing the said dealing, he, the said Williams, in or about the year of our Lord 1720, applied himself to your orator, in order to become your orator's partner therein; and after several such applications and meetings between him and your orator for that purpose, your orator agreed that the said Joseph Williams should become his partner." The depositions showed that Williams was to enter into this "trade," and to pay half the expenses of it on the roads, at inns, ale-houses, markets, and fairs, and to furnish his share of necessaries, such as horses, bridles, saddles, assistants, and servants. The partnership was only for one year, and to terminate at Michaelmas, 1721. The "trade" was to be plied on Hounslow, Heston, and Black Heaths, at Finchley-common, Bagshot, and Wimbledon, in Surrey, Salisbury, in Wiltshire, and elsewhere; in which places they dealt with gentlemen for divers watches, rings, swords, canes, hats, cloaks, horses, bridles, saddles, and other things (purses, doubtless, though not mentioned). In this "trade" they were so successful that they soon were in possession of £2,000. But when said Everett called on said Williams to render a full and fair account, and to divide the proceeds (for Williams is made to appear to have been "the Judas and carried the bag"), instead of so dividing he made similar claims on Everett, and these being refused, commenced an action at law against him in the Court of Common Pleas, and actually obtained verdict for £20; on which account, and also because said

Williams threatened said Everett with fresh law-suits, and moreover maligned his character, denied the receipts of money attributed to him, and even denied the contract of partnership (which the plaintiff admits was not in writing but merely oral), the complainant seeks redress from the Court of Exchequer, and prays that the defendant may be cited and compelled to show a fair account by the production of all the necessary books, papers, writings, memoranda, and accounts; that he may be compelled to make a fair division of profits on the accounts so proved, and may be restrained from any further action at law against the said complainant. This bill was filed October 3, 1725. Immediately on the filing of the bill, Mr. Sergeant Girard, counsel for defendant, moved that it be referred to John Harding, Esq., D. R. of the court, as scandalous and impudent, which was done, and on his report the bill being pronounced scandalous and impudent, Everett was sentenced to pay costs, and the solicitors, White and Wreathock, were summoned into court by the tipstaff, and each of them fined £50 or to be committed to the Fleet till the fines were paid. Wreathock was imprisoned accordingly six months. John Collins, Esq., whose name appeared upon the bill, was also sentenced to pay such costs as the deputy should state. Wreathock was afterward tried at the Old Bailey for being concerned in robbing Dr. Lancaster, in company with several others, and transported for life.—*Albany Law Journal.*

#### APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. GEORGE RUSSELL ROGERSON, of Liverpool, has been appointed a Country Commissioner for administering oaths in the High Court of Chancery; also for taking affidavits in the Court of Exchequer of Pleas.

#### LEGAL ITEMS.

The clerical staff of the Probate Court will be transferred to Somerset House about the middle of this month. It will occupy that portion of the building formerly in the possession of the Admiralty, including the rooms which, since the transfer of the last named office to Spring-gardens, have been used by the Exchequer and Audit Department.—*Civil Service Review.*

Mr. Thomas Erskine Holland, B.C.L., M.A., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-law, has been elected Chichele's Professor of International Law and Diplomacy at Oxford. The vacancy in the professorship was caused by the resignation of the Right Hon. Mountague Bernard. Mr. Holland was called to the bar in January, 1863, and is a member of the Home Circuit.

At Stafford, on July 25th, in sentencing a prisoner found guilty under the Debtors' Act of unlawfully concealing a certain part of his property with intent to defraud, Lush, J., pointed out that while the tendency of recent legislation was to look with increasing leniency upon an honest but unfortunate debtor, provisions had also been enacted by which fraud was to be regarded as a criminal offence, to be severely punished. He therefore sentenced the prisoner to eighteen months' imprisonment, with hard labour, adding that if the prisoner was prepared to surrender to his creditors the moneys he had concealed, he would be ready to intercede with the Secretary of State for a partial remission of the sentence.

The *Times* has this week devoted a leader to the grievance which it maintains is suffered by the public through the absence of a fine open way for vehicles and passengers through the Temple, from Fleet-street to the Embankment. The *Times* is very severe on the selfishness of the benchers, and makes use of dire, though rather mysterious, threats against them. Oddly enough, the very same day, it contains, in a letter from its Dublin correspondent, a strong protest against the appropriation to the use of the militia of a couple of houses in Dublin near "a building known as the Temple," in which law lectures are delivered, and near which the law library and several houses occupied by barristers are situated. The "correspondent" invokes the speedy action of Government in the matter. "It requires," he says, "a greater concentration of thought than most readers can realize to pursue the study of the law, with all its abstruse and complicated questions, its subtle

distinctions and elaborate technicalities ; " and he pleads for quiet and silence, and that the " seclusion " of the Temple may not be invaded, or its " sanctity " violated. Surely the " leader " must be right, and the " letter " wrong. The barristers of Dublin are very selfish not to welcome the militia into their midst, even at the sacrifice of some little amount of the quiet which their labours undoubtedly require.

### PUBLIC COMPANIES.

#### GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

LAST QUOTATION, July 31, 1874.

3 per Cent. Consols, 92½	Annuities, April, '85 9½
Ditto for Account, Aug. 92½	Do. (Red See T.) Aug. 190½
3 per Cent. Reduced 92½	Ex Bills, £1000, 2½ per Ct. 4 pm.
New 3 per Cent., 92½	Ditto, £500, Do 4 pm.
Do. 3½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Ditto, £100 & £200, 4 pm.
Do. 2½ per Cent., Jan. '94	Bank of England Stock, 5 Ct. (last half-year) 259
Do. 5 per Cent., Jan. '73	Ditto for Account.
Annuities, Jan. '80 —	

#### INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

Ditto 5 per Cent., July, '80 107½	Ditto, 5½ per Cent., May, '79 102
Ditto for Account, —	Ditto Debentures, per Cent
Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct. '81 103½	April, '64 —
Ditto, ditto, Certificates, —	Do. Do, 5 per Cent., Aug. '73 100½
Ditto, ditto, Ppr., 4 per Cent. 95	Do. Bonds, 4 per Ct., £1000
Ind. Enf. Pr., 5 p C., Jan. '73	Ditto, ditto, under £1000

#### RAILWAY STOCK.

Railways.	Paid.	Closing Price
Stock Bristol and Exeter .....	100	126
Stock Caledonian .....	100	93½
Stock Glasgow and South-Western .....	100	—
Stock Great Eastern Ordinary Stock .....	100	43½
Stock Great Northern .....	100	139½
Stock "Do, A Stock" .....	100	157½
Stock Great Southern and Western of Ireland .....	100	107
Stock Great Western—Original .....	100	120
Stock Lancashire and Yorkshire .....	100	145½
Stock London, Brighton, and South Coast .....	100	81½
Stock London, Chatham, and Dover .....	100	21½
Stock London and North-Western .....	100	153
Stock London and South Western .....	100	113½
Stock Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln .....	100	7½
Stock Metropolitan .....	100	64
Stock "Do, District .....	100	24½
Stock Midland .....	100	129
Stock North British .....	100	61½
Stock North Eastern .....	100	16½
Stock North London .....	100	109
Stock North Staffordshire .....	100	64
Stock South Devon .....	100	64
Stock South-Eastern .....	100	111

\* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

#### MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

On Thursday the Bank rate was raised to 3 per cent. from 2½, at which it was fixed on the 18th June. On Saturday railway stocks were very inactive, and on Monday stock of the North Eastern Company fell 4 per cent. There was another general decline in these securities on Tuesday, but on Wednesday the market improved. This improvement has not been maintained. Foreign securities were stronger on Saturday, and generally speaking they have been firm throughout the week. The raising of the Bank rate caused some slight flatness, but there was a speedy show of recovery.

The prospectus of Milner's Safe Company, Limited, just issued, states that the company has been formed to take over the important business of Messrs. Thos. Milner & Son, Holdfast Fire-resisting Safe Manufacturers, Phoenix Safe Works, Liverpool, Manchester, London, &c., the present change in the constitution of the business being necessitated by the declining health of the head of the firm, and the growing responsibility attached to a large and increasing trade. The business of Messrs. Milner has been successfully carried on for nearly a century by the late Mr. Thomas Milner, and by the present senior partner, Mr. William Milner, and by Mr. D. R. Ratcliff. Milner's safes have an established reputation throughout the commercial world, and the frequent tests to which they have been publicly subjected, together with the hundreds of destructive fires in which their safes have proved their efficiency, render further comment unnecessary as to their character and repute. The undertaking is in a flourishing condition, and

will be taken over as a going concern in full and profitable work, as from 1st June last. The capital of the company is £150,000 in 15,000 shares of £10 each, of which 10,500 are now offered for subscription. The shares are quoted at 2½ premium.

### COURT PAPERS.

#### VACATION NOTICES.

##### COURT OF CHANCERY.

During the long vacation, 1874, until further notice all applications which are of an urgent nature are to be made to the Vice-Chancellor Sir Charles Hall.

The Vice-Chancellor will sit at his chambers on Wednesday in every week, till further notice, for the purpose of hearing such applications.

The necessary papers relating to every application are to be left at the Vice-Chancellor's chambers, if possible, before one o'clock on the day previous to that on which the application is intended to be made.

In cases of great emergency, applications to the Vice-Chancellor may be sent by book post, accompanied with the brief of counsel, endorsed with the terms of the order applied for, and a copy of such endorsement on foolscap paper, with an envelope addressed to the solicitor making the application, and such other papers as may be thought necessary.

On applications for injunctions or writs of *Ne exeat Regno*, there must be sent, in addition to the above, a copy of the bill, a certificate of bill filed, and office copies of the affidavits in support of the application.

The counsel's brief sent to the Vice-Chancellor will, when any order is made thereon, be returned direct to the Registrar, and a copy of the endorsement on counsel's brief of the order made will be sent by post to the solicitor making the application.

The address of the Vice-Chancellor can be obtained at his chambers.

The chambers of the Vice-Chancellor will be open on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Thursdays and Fridays during the vacation, from eleven to one o'clock.

The equity judges' chambers (other than those of the Vice-Chancellor Sir Charles Hall) will be closed on Saturday, 8th August, at four o'clock p.m., and be re-opened on Thursday, 29th October, at ten o'clock a.m.

#### COMMON LAW JUDGES' CHAMBERS.

Summons will be issued and made returnable at eleven o'clock at the chambers of the judges of the court in which the actions are pending.

As to applications to be made to Mr. Justice Blackburn:—Acknowledgments of deeds will be taken at eleven o'clock. Adjourned summonses will be heard first at eleven o'clock, and the summonses of the day will be taken immediately afterwards. Counsel will be heard at half-past twelve o'clock.

As to applications to be made to the masters:—Adjourned summonses will be heard at eleven o'clock precisely in each court, and the summonses of the day immediately afterwards. Counsel will be heard at twelve o'clock.

Mr. Justice Blackburn directs particular attention to the rules of Michaelmas Term 1867, and desires it to be distinctly understood that he will not hear any summons or application, directed by the said rules to be heard by the masters, unless such summons or application shall be specially referred to him by the master.

Whenever a summons is served with notice to attend by counsel, the name of counsel (if known) should be written on the copy summons served upon the opposite party.

### BIRTHS.

BRIGGS.—On July 26, at 1, St John's-place, Abbey-road, N.W., the wife of Thomas Henry Briggs, Esq., barrister-at-law, of a daughter.

MACKAY.—On July 27, at 7, Colville-terrace east, the wife of Alexander H. L. Mackay, barrister-at-law, of a son.

MACKIE.—On July 28, at Linlithgow, N.B., the wife of Joseph Mackie, solicitor, of a son.

MYBURGH.—On July 27, at 73, Queensborough-terrace, Hyde-park, the wife of Philip Albert Myburgh, Esq., barrister-at-law, of a daughter.

RAVENHILL.—On July 21, at 21, Regent's-park-terrace, N.W., the wife of William W. Ravenhill, barrister-at-law, of a son.

## LONDON GAZETTES.

## Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

TUESDAY, July 28, 1874.

Babu, Silas, and George Cecil Winkworth, Oxford st, Regent's circus, Middlesex, Attorneys. July 18.

TUESDAY, July 21, 1874.

## COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER.

Otto and Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented July 4, directed to be heard before the V.C. at the Assize Courts, Strangeways, Manchester, on Friday, Aug 7, at 10. Gardner and d Horner, Manchester, solicitors for the petitioners.

FRIDAY, July 24, 1874.

## UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Glen Valley Railway Act.—Petition for winding up, directed to be heard before V.C. Malins on Aug 1. Barlow and Co, Essex st, Strand solicitors for the petitioner.

Teme Valley Railway.—The M.R. has, by an order, dated June 22, appointed George Bushut Godson, Great Queen st, Westminster, to be official liquidator.

## LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Combined Services Co-operative Association, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented July 22, directed to be heard before V.C. Malins on July 31. Reep and Co, Bush lane, Cannon st, solicitors for the petitioners.

Petani Gas Company, Limited.—Creditors are required, on or before Sept 15, to send in their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Francois Mackenzie, Joseph Weatherley, and Augustus Albert Smith, Fenchurch st, Monday, Nov 2 at 12 is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

Wear Engine Works Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented July 22, directed to be heard before V.C. Bacon, on July 31. Oliver and Borterei, Quality court, Chancery lane, agents for Tilley, Sunderland, solicitor for the petitioner.

## Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

TUESDAY, July 21, 1874.

Gardner, Charles Henry, West Harding st, Printers' Engineer. Aug 19. Gardner v Gardner, M.R. Needham, New inn

Hankin, Thomas, Gloucester terrace, Gloucester rd, Kensington, Gent. Sept 1. Sewell v Dixon, M.R. Beaumont and Son, Lincoln's-inn-fields

Hubbard, John, Walbrook, Gent. Oct 1. Brookes v Cox, V.C. Bacon. Hubbard, Long lane, West Smithfield

Pownall, Robert, late subscriber to Lloyd's Rooms. Oct 29. Clark v Lloyds, V.C. Hall. McDiarmid, Old Jewry chambers

Spencer, William, Reading Berks, Pork, Butcher. Aug 24. Quelch v Spencer, M.R. Beale, Reading

Williams, John, Danygraig House, Penlline, Glamorgan, Farmer. Sep 30. Williams v Lewis, M.R. Stockwood, Bedfordshire

FRIDAY, July 24, 1874.

Burdon, William Wharton, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Esq. Nov 1. De Buys v D'Audibert, V.C. Bacon. Hoyle, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Everett, William, Erit, Kent, Gent. Oct 1. Everett v Everett, V.C. Malins. Poole, Bartholomew close

Gibbs, Edmund James, Margate, Kent, Gent. Sept 2. Gibbs v White, V.C. Hall. Brocke, Margate

Prie, Mary Ann, Llywn u, Abergavenny, Monmouth. Sept 25. Davies v Jones, V.C. Hall. Sept 25. Harrison, New inn, Strand

Smith, Arthur, Avenue rd, Lewisham, Gent. Oct 15. Christie v Smith, V.C. Malins. Lloyd, Gray's inn place

## NEXT OF KIN.

Hunter, Millikin, Liverpool, Merchant. Oct 29. Brealey v Stewart, M.R. McCleure, Robert John Le Messier, Duke st, St James'. Nov 2. V.C. Hall.

## Creditors under 22 &amp; 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

TUESDAY, July 21, 1874.

Atkinson, Joseph, Hutton Fields, York, Farmer. Sept 1. Watson, Bernard Castle

Atkin, Thomas, Deddington, Oxford, Farmer. Sept 18. Lovell, Deddington

Bloom, Savannah, Fortescue rd, Paddington. Aug 20. Roberts, South square, Gray's inn

Brooke, Mary, Clifton, Bristol. Oct 1. Fussell and Co, Bristol

Cave, Charles Armand, Milton House, Wood Green, Gent. Aug 30

Warry and Co, Lincoln's inn fields

Coxes, John, Scarborough, York, Gent. Aug 24. Cobb, York

Dales, Joseph, Martletwy, Pembrokeshire, Farmer. Aug 31. Lewis, Narberth

Dackett, William, Acerington, Lancashire, Stonemason. Aug 12. Whalley, Acerington

Elliott, Sarah, Wrington, Somerset. Sept 30. Harwood, Bristol

Gedall, James, Soutport, Lancashire, Retired Corn Miller. Oct 1. Geddes, Biddulphfield

Hargreaves, William, Craven Hill gardens, Baywater, Esq. Sept 16. Horne and Hunter, Lincoln's inn fields

Harrison, Alfred Henry, Gracechurch st, Ship Owner. Aug 19. Lambert and Ramkill, Mitre chambers, Fenchurch st

Helli, Letitia, Odiham, Southampton. Aug 16. Bayley, Basingstoke

Ley, formerly John, Bedford square, Esq. Oct 1. Bonner, London st, Fenchurch st

Loxley, Lucy, Lydbrook, Gloucester. Sept 1. Wintle and Manle, Newham

Mardon, William, Great Houghton, York, Farmer. Aug 20. Newman and Son, Barnsley

Newton, Raymond D'Arcy, New Hampton, Middlesex, Esq. Aug 18. Bolton, Elm court, Temple

Pollard, William Richard, Preston, Lancashire, Esq. Sept 11. Fraser and Watson, Wisbeach

Pratt, Richard, Alpha House, Twickenham, Gent. Sept 1. Southee, Ely place, Holborn

Friarsay, Wade Cawthorn, Pontefract, York, Druggist. Sept 2. Carter Pontefract

Richardson, William, Light Oak, Killington, Westmoreland, Yeoman. Oct 1. Pearson and Pearson, Kirkby Lonsdale Story, John Bainbridge, Jun, Lockington, Leicester, Esq. Sept 1. Birch and Co, Lincoln's inn fields

Waide, Francis Cruise, Ackworth Moor Top, York, Farmer. Sept 16. Carter, Pontefract

Wright, Rev John Marsden, Tatham, Lancashire. Oct 1. Pearson and Pearson, Kirkby Lonsdale

FRIDAY, July 24, 1874.

Abbott, Eliza, Eastwood, Nottingham. Sept 12. Thurman, Alfreton

Abell, William, Derby, Engineer. Oct 21. Moody, Derby

Allison, Charles, Lincoln, Farmer. Oct 1. Williams, Lincoln

Birch, Peter, Liverpool, Gent. Aug 20. Salter, Ellesmere

Birdsey, David, Soubury, Buckingham, Farmer. Aug 29. Newton, Leighton Buzzard

Bowen, John Gething, Langley Mill, Derby, Miller. Sept 1. Towle and Gilbert, Nottingham

Brittain, Hugh, Chapel Chorlton, Stafford, Gent. Sept 1. Cooper, Newcastle-under-Lyme

Cook, William, Redhill, Surrey, Builder. Aug 31. Morrison, Reigate

Cooke, Jane, Preston, Lancashire. Oct 1. Banks, Preston

Crewe, Charles Hugh, Ropton Hayes, Derby, Esq. Sept 10. Sale, Derby

Currie, William, Liverpool, Wine and Spirit Merchant. Sept 20. Bateson and Co, Liverpool

Duckers, Peter, Finsley green, Chester, Labourer. Aug 24. Jones, Wetherby

Durand, Hon Sir Henry Marion, Major General. Oct 1. Bell and Co, Lincoln's inn fields

Gilbert, Samuel, Ennis rd, Finsbury, Park, Gent. Oct 20. Chamberlain, Basinghall st

Hills, William, St. Mary Cray, Kent, Bricklayer. Sept 10. May and Co, Adelaide place, London Bridge

Hinckes, Theodosia, Tettenhall Wood, Stafford. Nov 1. Hawker and Co, Bedford row

Lister, William, Red House, Hornsey, Gent. Oct 1. Van Sandau and Cumming, King st, Cheapside

Lloyd, Benjamin, Little Dawley, Salop, Licensed Victualler. Sept 1. Potts, Broseley

Oddie, Joseph Crompton, Woodlesford, York, Gent. Oct 31. Coleman and Sangster, Pontefract

Parker, Henry, Weston-super-Mare, Somerset, Blacksmith. July 30. Davies, Weston-super-Mare

Smethurst, Moses, Bolton, Lancashire, Licensed Victualler. Sept 1. Esmew and Pennington, Bolton

Smith, William, Everett, Milton st, Dorset square, Gent. Oct 20. Gordon, Lincoln's inn fields

Steer, Henry, Bantead, Surrey, Farmer. Aug 31. Morrison, Reigate

Titsey, William John, Madeley, Salop, Gent. Sept 21. Potts, Broseley

Townsend, Mary, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Sept 1. Swan and Arnott, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Tuck, Thomas, Hatfield, Dacres Park, Lee, Kent, Gent. Sept 10. Stephens, Maidstone

Whitaker, Joseph, Mansfield, Nottingham. Aug 25. Bailey, Derby

## Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, July 24, 1874.

## Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Bristol, Charles, Cooperage, Dockhead, Cooper. Pet April 21. Hazlitt. Aug 6 at 12.30

Carr, Henry Theophilus, Mincing lane, Commission Agent. Pet July 22. Hazlitt. Aug 7 at 11

Cruickshank, John, Blagrove rd, St John's Wood, Commission Agent. Pet July 22. Hazlitt. Aug 6 at 12

Lyon, James, Elias, Langham Hotel, Langham place. Pet July 22. Hazlitt. Aug 7 at 11.30

Thomson, James, Great College st, Camden Town, Builder. Pet July 22. Hazlitt. Aug 7 at 12

To Surrender in the County.

Duncalf, James, Derby, Joiner. Pet July 20. Weller, Derby. Aug 6 at 12

Sturgess, James, Manchester, Boot Manufacturer. Pet July 23. Kay. Manchester, Aug 6 at 9.30

To Surrender in the County.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debt to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Davies, Elizabeth, Torrion avenue, Camden Town, Widow. Pet July 24. Hazlitt. Aug 11 at 1

Gordon, Patrick Pirie, Talbot rd, Westbourne Park, Coffee Planter. Pet July 25. Hazlitt. Aug 14 at 11

Viner, John, De Laune st, Kennington Park rd, Printer's Manager. Pet July 25. Hazlitt. Aug 11 at 11

To Surrender in the County.

Baynes, John, Manchester, Shipping Merchant. Pet July 23. Halton. Manchester, Aug 20 at 9.30

Brougham, William, Lincoln, Grocer. Pet July 23. Appleby. Lincoln. Aug 8 at 12

Chambers, Cornelius, Sheffield, Comb Manufacturer. Pet July 23. Rodgers, Sheffield, Aug 20 at 12

Christie, James John, and George Augustus Gutch, North Shields, Northumberland, Engine Builders. Pet July 23. Mortimer. Newcastle, Aug 11 at 12

Edwards, David, Macclesfield, Cheshire, Silk Twist Manufacturer. Pet July 24. Marr, Macclesfield, Aug 10 at 11

Gray, John Lynas, Liverpool, Provision Merchant. Pet July 24. Watson. Liverpool, Aug 10 at 2

Hainsworth, Joseph Fisher, Ossett, York, Manufacturer. Pet July 23. Nelson, Dawsbury, Aug 13 at 12

Harrold, James Charles, Edmonton, Middlesex, Auctioneer. Pet July 23. Pulley, Edmonton, Aug 11 at 12

Lee, Robert, Catfield, Norfolk, Grocer. Pet July 21. Cooke. Norwich, Aug 14 at 12

Ward, Benjamin. Pet July 23. Eaden, Cambridge, Aug 8 at 2.30  
Wardle, Frederick, Ashley, Salop. Pet July 23. Broughton, Crewe,  
Aug 30 at 11

## BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, July 24, 1874.

Caman, William Blamire, Camberwell New rd, Gent. July 17

TUESDAY, July 28, 1874.

Harvey, Charles, Old Portswod, Southampton, Baker. July 23  
Pollard, Edward Hutchinson, St Petersburg, Russia. July 23

## Liquidation by Arrangement.

## FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

FRIDAY, July 24, 1874.

Aikins, Henry, Walsall Wood, Stafford, Grocer. Aug 4 at 11 at offices of  
Glover, Park st, WalsallAngerstein, William John Nettleship, Ashby Lodge, near Daventry,  
Northampton. Gent. Aug 13 at 2 at offices of Lawrence and Co,Appleby, William James, Shanklin, Isle of Wight, Hairdresser. Aug  
7 at 11 at offices of Bul, St Andrew's villas, ShanklinArmstrong, William, Liverpool, Watch Maker. Aug 10 at 3 at offices  
of Barrell and Rodway, Lord st, LiverpoolBagnall, Samuel Freeman, Norwich, Surgeon. Aug 6 at 11 at offices of  
Simpson, Tombland, NorwichBaskerville, Daniel, Leckhampton, Gloucester, Nurseryman. Aug 7 at  
11 at offices of Moores and Romney, TewkesburyBeazer, Thomas, Marshfield, Gloucester, Farmer. Aug 1 at 12 at  
offices of Pocock, Union st, Bath. Essery, BristolBeer, William, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Jeweller. Aug 6 at 12 at offices  
of Hoyle and Co., Collingwood st, Newcastle-upon-TyneBradshaw, John, Leeds, Carrier. Aug 4 at 12 at offices of Hardwick,  
Boat lane, LeedsBrady, Frederic Henry, Birmingham, Steel Merchant. Aug 6 at 2 at  
offices of Davies, Bennett's hill, BirminghamBrown, Nathan, Manchester, Commission Agent. Aug 4 at 10 at offices  
of Garthwaite, Brantstone, ManchesterBrowne, Frances Mary, Lower Kensington gore. Aug 7 at 12 at Bur-  
lington-gardens. AbrahamsCarter, Albert Thomas, Oxford st, Boot Maker. Aug 10 at 2 at offices  
of Bohm, New inn, StrandCheetham, George, Lincoln, Fishmonger. Aug 6 at 11 at offices of Jay,  
Bank st, Lincoln. Rex, LincolnColeman, George, jun, and George Tunstall Coleman, Cardiff, Glamorgan,  
corn Dealers. Aug 12 at 2 at offices of Barnard and Co,

Albion chambers, Bristol. Welford

Cooper, Henry Christopher, Bedford, Music Seller. Aug 7 at 1 at  
the Inns of Court Hotel, Holborn. Jebs, BedfordCope, William, Birmingham, out of business. Aug 7 at 10.30 at offices  
of Duke, Christ Church passage, BirminghamCousens, Samuel, Billdeston, Suffolk, no occupation. Aug 12 at 12 at  
offices of Pollard, St. Lawrence st, IpswichCowen, John, Workington, Cumberland, Game Dealer. Aug 6 at 12  
at offices of Hayton and Simpson, CockermouthCox, Samuel Edward, Eastleigh, Southampton, Innkeeper. Aug 5 at  
13 at offices of Guy, Albion terrace, SouthamptonCrawley, William Keighton, Plumstead, Kent, Baker. Aug 5 at 3.30 at  
offices of Shaw and Tremellen, Gray's inn squareCrichton, Robert, Liverpool, Shipwright. Aug 4 at 4 at offices of  
Hime and Co, Lord st, Liverpool. Lawrence and Dixon, LiverpoolCroft, Richard, Castleford, York, Tailor. Aug 5 at 3 at the Commer-  
cial Hotel, Albion st, Leeds. Stocks and Nettleton, CastlefordCroft, William, Torquay, Devon, Stationer. Aug 10 at 12 at offices of  
Hooper and Wollen, Carlton House, TorquayCutting, Horace, Swansea, Glamorgan, Auctioneer. Aug 5 at 3 at  
offices of Clifton and Woodward, Wind st, SwanseaDale, Henry, jun, Northallerton, York, Currier. Aug 6 at 2 at the  
King's Arms Hotel, Northallerton. MilburnDavies, George, Manchester, Timber Merchant. Aug 6 at 3 at offices  
of Bond and Son, Dickinson st, ManchesterDavies, Hannah, Treherbert, Glamorgan, Grocer. Aug 12 at 2 at offices  
of Rossler and Phillips, Post Office chambers, PontypriddDeacon, Francis, Aberystwith, Cardigan, Gent. Aug 5 at 11 at offices  
of Atwood, Baker st, CardiganDobson, Henry, Park grange, York, Farmer. Aug 7 at 2 at offices of  
Robinson, Chancery lane, DarlingtonEarnshaw, Sarah, Leeds, Milliner. Aug 5 at 11 at offices of Teale and  
Appleton, Trinity st, LeedsEpps, Moses, Canterbury, Kent, Builder. Aug 15 at 2 at the Sun Inn,  
Sun st, Canterbury. Webb, Queen Victoria stGingell, Eli, Trowbridge, Wils, Cloth Dealer. Aug 3 at 3 at offices of  
Pocock and Son, Union st, BathGordin, David Cumberland, Romford, Essex, Licensed Victualler. Aug  
4 at 12 at offices of Thwaites, Basinghall st, Fenchurch, London wallGreenland, Henry, Bristol, Tailor. July 31 at 11 at offices of Williams,  
Bristol chambers, Nicholas stGrobecker, Thomas Barber, Cornhill, Sworn Broker. Aug 8 at 12 at  
offices of Stophier, Colman stGuerrier, Luke Dawson, Metropolitan Meat Market, Meat Salesman.  
Aug 19 at 3 at offices of Pearce and Son, Giltspur stHall, George, Birmingham, out of business. Aug 5 at 10.15 at offices of  
East, Colemore row, BirminghamHall, Phineas, Little Bolton, Lancashire, Contractor. Aug 7 at 3 at the  
Three Crown Inn, Denegate, Bolton. Robinson, BoltonHall, William, Somerton Booths, Cheshire Miller. Aug 11 at 3 at the  
Lion and Swan Hotel, Congleton. Garride, CongletonBatchfield, Christopher, South Kelsey, Lincoln, Saddler. Aug 6 at 1 at  
6, Wrawby st, Brigg. RobbsHawkins, Edmund, High st, Hornsey, Builder. Aug 1 at 3 at the  
Gerrard Arms, Gerrard st, Islington. Fenton, Colebrooke row,  
IslingtonHewer, John, Webster, Appledore, Devon, Grocer. Aug 6 at 3 at offices  
of Bromham, High st, BarnstapleHoldsworth, Samuel, Ripon, York, Miller. Aug 11 at 3 at the Studley  
Royal Hotel, Ripon. FowlerJackson, John, Gillithwaite's Farm, York, Farmer. Aug 6 at 3 at offices of  
Hesp and Co, Station st, HuddersfieldJacobs, Sidney, Camberwell New rd, Gent. Aug 7 at 3 at offices of  
Buckler and Co, Fenchurch stJohnson, Isaac, Blaydon-on-Tyne, Durham, Timber Merchant. Aug  
12 at 2 at offices of Joel, Newgate st, Newcastle-on-TyneKirkley, Thomas, Liverpool, Jeweller. Aug 6 at 12 at offices of Fowle  
and Carruthers, Clayton square, LiverpoolKnight, George Benjamin, Smethwick, Stafford, Clerk. Aug 4 at 3 at  
offices of Cheston, Moor st, BirminghamLawrence, Henry, Lower Phillimore place, Kensington, Chemist. Aug  
5 at 2 at offices of Hale and Co, CheapsideLeadbetter, George, and George Clifford, Dronfield, Derby, Furniture  
Dealers. Aug 4 at 11 at offices of Catts, Low pavement, ChesterfieldLobby, Jeremiah, Stow, Dewsbury, York, Pawnbroker. Aug 11 at 3  
at the Royal Hotel, Dewsbury. Burton and MouldingMaddock, Henry, Brook st, Ratcliff, Baker. Aug 5 at 3 at the New  
Corn Exchange Hotel, Market lane. Sweepstone, York at West,  
Commercial rd EastMalpas, Thomas, Longton, Stafford, Shopkeeper. Aug 13 at 11 at  
offices of Welch, Caroline st, LongtonMann, Harry, Birmingham, Grocer. Aug 7 at 12 at offices of Duke,  
Christ Church passage, BirminghamMarborrough, William, Bishopsgate st Within, Mining Share Dealer.  
Aug 7 at 12 at offices of Wilde, Graham st, Elderton and Emmet,  
Pump court, TempleMarriner, Eleanor, Houghton-le-Spring, Durham, Boot Dealer. Aug 6  
at 12 at offices of Wright, John st, SunderlandMarsden, Richard, Savile Town, York, Uyer. Aug 11 at 2 at the Royal  
Hotel, Dewsbury. Walker, DewsburyMarsh, Sayer, Ramsgate, Kent, Stationer. Aug 4 at 3 at the Guildhall  
Coffee house. Edwards, RamsgateMarshall, John Rodger, Armine st, York, Commercial Traveller. Aug 3  
at 3 at offices of Fawcett and Malcolm, Park row, LeedsMason, Allan, Purson Jaglin, York, Builder. Aug 4 at 3 at the Manx  
House Inn, Westgate, Wakefield. Stocks and Nettleton, WakefieldMaynard, George Nathan, Whittleford, Cambridge, Ironmonger.  
Aug 10 at 11 at the Green Dragon Hotel, Bishopsgate st Within,  
Knockier, Great DunmowMountain, William, Bradford, York, Auctioneer. Aug 5 at 11 at  
offices of Watson and Dicksons, Victoria Chambers, Market st,  
BradfordMousley, Thomas Charles, John Mousley, and Frederick Wood, Birming-  
ham, Electro plate Manufacturers. Aug 6 at 3 at offices of Fowle,  
Ann st, BirminghamMuschamp, John Thomas, Boston, Lincoln, Gasfitter. Aug 6 at 1 at  
offices of Wise and Harwood, Church yard, BostonMyers, Long, Yeadon, York, Cloth Manufacturer. Aug 4 at 3 at offices  
of Carr, Albion st, LeedsNeil, Thomas, Sheffield, Warehouseman. Aug 3 at 11 at offices of  
Binney and Sons, Queen st chambers, SheffieldNewman, Henry Alfred, Great Quebec st, Grocer. Aug 6 at 3 at offices  
of Davis, New InnOrr, Robert Thomas, Ipswich, Suffolk, Architect. Aug 6 at 11 at  
offices of Villany, Tower st, IpswichPage, Henry, Reading, Merchant's Clerk. Aug 6 at 11 at offices of  
Dodd, Friar st, ReadingParker, George, Rusholme, near Manchester, Boot Manufacturer. Aug 11  
at 3 at offices of Cobbatt and Co, Brown st, ManchesterPaulin, Frederick, St George's rd, Peckham, Brewer. Aug 6 at 2 at  
offices of Howse, Staple inn, HelbornPetten, Robert, Iwerne Courtney, Dorset, Bootmaker. Aug 5 at 11 at  
the Railway Hotel, Blandford. AtkinsonPhillips, Frederick, Lower Walmer, Kent, Baker. Aug 7 at 11 at  
Middle st, Deal. DrewPhillips, Owen, Carmarthen, Licensed Victualler. Aug 6 at 2 at  
offices of Evans, Queen st, CarmarthenPoulton, John Long, West Derby, Lancashire, Beerhouse Keeper. Aug  
6 at 2 at offices of Blackhurst, Dale st, LiverpoolRollings, Richard, Pembroke Dock, Pembroke, Grocer. Aug 10 at 9.30  
at the Guildhall, Carmarthen. Parry, Pembroke DockRussell, Arthur James Forbes, Worksop, Nottingham, Surgeon. Aug  
6 at 1 at the Lion Hotel, Worksop. Hodding and BeeverSaw, James, Manchester, Beerhouse Manager. Aug 6 at 3 at offices of  
Bent, Piccadilly, ManchesterSheppard, George, Birmingham, Steel Toy Maker. Aug 5 at 2 at offices  
of Davis, Bennett's hill, BirminghamShrapnell, Henry, Bradford, Wils, Attorney. Aug 3 at 11 at offices of  
Pocock and Son, Union st, BathSmith, John, Lower Gornal, Stafford, Horse Dealer. Aug 5 at 11 at  
offices of Barrow, Queen st, WolverhamptonSquires, John, Devonport, Devon, General Dealer. Aug 10 at 3 at  
offices of Begg and Rundle, Ker st, DevonportStocks, John, Vulnec, Pudsey, York, Baker. Aug 6 at 3 at offices of  
Carr, Albion st, LeedsStuckey, Frederick Jonathan, Merthyr Tydfil, Glamorgan, Brewer.  
Aug 4 at 11 at offices of Smith and Co, Victoria st, Merthyr TydfilSymonds, Richard, Stow, Berks, Miller. Aug 11 at 12 at offices of  
Jotcham, Newbury st, WantageTame, Thomas, Oxford, Wine and Spirit Merchant. Aug 14 at 12 at  
offices of Swears, Corn Market st, OxfordTaphouse, Henry John Barrow-in-Furness, Lancashire, Photographer.  
Aug 7 at 11 at the Temperance Hotel, Strand, Barrow-in-Furness

Taylor, Barrow-in-Furness

Thompson, Joseph, St George's, Gloucester, Mason. Aug 5 at 12 at  
offices of Thick, Small st, BristolThurston, Renken, Clevedon, Somerset, Grocer. Aug 11 at 12 at offices  
of Hancock and Co, Guildhall, Broad st, Bristol. Benson and  
Thomas, BristolTurnbull, Richard, Hebburn New Town, Durham, Labourer. Aug 4  
at 2 at offices of Joel, Newgate st, Newcastle-upon-TyneTurner, Henry, Liverpool, Cabinet Maker. Aug 10 at 3 at offices of  
Nordon, Cook st, LiverpoolTurner, James Edward, Great Tower st, Wine Merchant. Aug 8 at 12  
at offices of Tidy and Co, Sackville st, PiccadillyVertue, Philip Algernon, and Frederick Henry Gooding, Borough  
High st, Seed Merchants. Aug 6 at 3 at offices of Sandon and  
Kersley, Gracechurch stWarman, James, Patterson st, Stepney, Carman. Aug 11 at 4 at  
offices of Peiham, Arbour sq, Stepney

Williams, George, Shrewsbury, Salop, Grocer. Aug 6 at 11 at offices of Harrison and Starkey, Cannon st, Birmingham. Shakespeare, Oldbury  
Woodcock, Thomas, and William Cliff, Leymoor, near Huddersfield. Aug 4 at 2.30 at offices of Sykes, New st, Huddersfield

TUESDAY, July 28, 1874.

Allen, William Georg, Aylstone, Leicester, Commission Agent. Aug 11 at 12 at offices of Haxby, Belvoir st, Leicester

Andrews, Thomas, Jun, Stockport, Cheshire, Draper. Aug 11 at 4 at offices of Addleshead and Warburton, King st, Manchester

Aitken, Henderson, Sunderland, Ironmonger. Aug 6 at 12 at offices of Thompson, John, Sunderland

Barnet Edmund, Leeds, Povision Merchant. Aug 6 at 3 at offices of North and Sons, East Parade, Leeds.

Bartlett, Charles, and Charles Henry Bartlett, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Scale Beam Makers. Aug 7 at 12 at offices of Sewell, Grey st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Bekett, James, Liverpool, Greengrocer. Aug 7 at 3 at offices of Vine, Dale st, Liverpool. Bartlett, Liverpool

Bethes, Thomas, Wolverhampton, Staff rd, Writing Clerk. Aug 8 at 11 at offices of Barrow, Queen st, Wolverhampton

Begbie, Robert Spear, Inverness rd, Baywater no trade. Aug 11 at 3 at offices of Lumley and Lumley, Conduit st, Bond st, London

Blake, James, Graham rd, Dalston, Stone Mason. Aug 10 at 2 at offices of Elam, Walkbrook

Bowen, James, Ellon's place, York rd, Battersea, Chandler's Shop Keeper. Aug 11 at 12 at offices of Haynes, Grecian Chambers, Devonshire Court, Temple

Clarke, Wiliam, James, Cardiff, Glamorgan, Licensed Victualler. Aug 10 at 2 at offices of Barnard and Co, Crockerbury Town, Cardiff. Griffith, Cardiff

Clegg, John Rice, Honiton, Devon, Innkeeper. Aug 12 at 10 at the Turk's Head Inn, Honiton. Tweed, Honiton

Clewlow, John, Birmingham, Foot and Shoe Manufacturer. Aug 10 at 3 at offices of Maher and Poncia, Temple st, Birmingham

Cole, Isaac, Goldsmith row, Hackney rd, Leather Seller. Aug 12 at 4 at offices of Pelham, Arbour square, Stepney

Cromwick, Edward, Bognor, Sussex, Chemist. Aug 8 at 12 at Dolly's Coffee house, King's Head Passage, Newgate st, Luckett, Wapping

Darke, Richard, Staines, Middlesex, Tailor Menter. Aug 11 at 2.30 at the London Tavern, Bishopsgate st, Within. Trinder, Bishopsgate st, Within

Dewy, Henry and Alfred Dewy, Bristol, Dealers in Tobacconists' Fancy Goods. Aug 1 at 11 at 34, Broad st, Bristol

Dewell, Christopher, Waddesdon, Buckingham, Coal Dealer. Aug 13 at 12 at offices of Parrot, Bourton st, Aylesbury

Dobie, John, Lincoln, Grocer. Aug 6 at 11 at offices of Dale, St Benedict's square, Lincoln

Downs, Robert, East Dereham, Norfolk, Pork Butcher. Aug 12 at 11 at offices of Wright and Barton, Quebec rd, East Dereham

Dracoll, Denis, Tooley st, Bermondsey, Carman. Aug 4 at 4 at 9, Lincoln's Inn Fields. Marshall

Elli, David, Manchester, Stationer. Aug 12 at 3 at offices of Addleshaw and Warburton, King st, Manchester

Everick, Frederick, Worcester, Stock and Share Broker. Aug 10 at 11 at 54, Broad st, Bee and Miller

Fitzsimon, Thomas, Callow hill, near Redditch, Worcester, Farmer. Aug 10 at 3 at offices of Parry, Bennett's hill, Birmingham

Freeman, Samuel, Leicester, Cabinet Maker. Aug 12 at 12 at offices of Morris and Son, Friar Lane, Leicester

Finch, William Lonsdale, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Engineer. Aug 10 at 2 at offices of Joel, Newcastle at, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Fugl, Henry Thomas, Packington st, Islington, Spring Manufacturer. Aug 12 at 12 at offices of Vickers, Southampton Buildings, Holborn

Garrow, Lucie, Bungay, Suffolk, Milliner. Aug 10 at 3 at offices of Kent, St Andrew's Hall piano, Norwich

Geddeson, Woolf, Cheapside, Tailor. Aug 7 at 2 at offices of Swaine, Cheapside

Gordon, John, Preston, Lancashire, Plumber. Aug 10 at 3 at offices of Plant and Abbott, Cannon st, Preston

Goulding, Henry Bond, Bartlett's buildings, Electro Platers' Agent. Aug 7 at 4 at offices of Lett, Bartlett's buildings, Holborn circus

Greshamhal, William, Liverpool, Cowkeeper. Aug 21 at 3 at offices of Lowe, Castle st, Liverpool

Grierson, Thomas, Merthyr Tydfil, Glamorgan, Travelling Draper. Aug 7 at 12 at offices of Beddoe, Victoria st, Merthyr Tydfil

Griffiths, Philip, Aberaman, Glamorgan, Tailor. Aug 7 at 1 at offices of Linton and Williams, Canon st, Aberdare

Guston, Thomas Daniel Edward, High st, Bow, Grocer. Aug 11 at 3 at offices of Heathfield, Lincoln's Inn Fields

Hall, William Fuller, Haverhill, Suffolk, Builder. Aug 11 at 12 at the Bell Inn, Haverhill. Jackson

Hancorn, Edward Mansel, Camberwell, Draper. Aug 8 at 12 at offices of Parkhouse and Sons, Bedford st, Plymouth. Wilson, Plymouth

Harrison, Daniel Alfred, St Albans, Hertford, Gent. Aug 14 at 2 at offices of Tatham, Queen Victoria st

Hewitt, Edward James, Clevedon, Somerset, Painter. Aug 10 at 12 at offices of Plummer, Bristol Chambers, Nicholas st, Bristol

Hewson, Thomas, New Broad st, Solicitor. Aug 6 at 2 at the Masons' Hall Tavern, Masons' Avenue, Coleman st, Sweetland, Moorgate st, Holborn, John, Tenby, Pembroke, Innkeeper. Aug 10 at 2 at the Town-hall, Carmarthen. Gwynn and Stokes, Tenby

Hibberd, Alfred Walter, Garlick Hill, Wine Merchant. Aug 6 at 12 at offices of Plunkett, Gutter Lane

Hinton, Thomas Wilfred, Gateshead, Durham, Carver. Aug 6 at 12 at offices of Bush, St Nicholas Buildings, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Hussey, Henry, Brighton, Sussex, Watchmaker. Aug 15 at 11 at 17, Great James st, Bedford Row, Goodman, Brighton

Jays, Frederick, Leicester, Grocer. Aug 11 at 3 at 4, New st, Leicester. Owston, Leicester

Jones, John, Hawley rd, Kentish Town, Butcher. Aug 8 at 10.15 at the Wrotham Arms, Wrotham rd, Camden New Town. Seale, Globe rd, Mile End

Jones, Lewis, Llanelli, Carmarthen, Grocer. Aug 10 at 11 at offices of Howell, Park st, Llanelli

Jones, Thomas, Netherton, Dudley, Worcester, Draper. Aug 10 at 3 at offices of Warrington, Castle st, Dudley

Jones, William, Wilmot, Cheshire, Draper. Aug 20 at 3 at offices of Richardson, Kennedy st, Manchester

Kempner, Isaac, and Marks Goldman, South Shields, Durham, Jewellers.

Aug 8 at 12 at offices of Purvis, King st, South Shields

Kent, Charles, Woodbridge, Suffolk, Hairdresser. Aug 7 at 3 at offices of Moulton, New st, Woodbridge. Walton, Woodbridge

Kershaw, John, Wakefield, York, Builder. Aug 10 at 4 at the Manor House Inn, Westgate, Wakefield. Stocks and Nettleton, Wakefield

Kershaw, Joseph, Wakefield, York, Builder. Aug 10 at 2 at the Manor House Inn, Westgate, Wakefield. Stocks and Nettleton, Wakefield

Ketley, Jonathan, Birmingham, Iron Merchant. Aug 7 at 3 at offices of Rawlins and Bagnall, Colmore Row, Birmingham

Lake, William George, Bading, Borks, Coal Merchant. Aug 11 at 11 at offices of Dryland, Friar st, Reading

McGovern, Joseph Henry, Liverpool, Licensed Victualler. Aug 10 at 2 at offices of Lump, Moorfields, Liverpool

Millward, Honcy, Ambleside rd, near Brierley Hill, Stafford, Builder. Aug 15 at 3 at the Talbot Hotel, High st, Stourbridge. Bowen, Bliston

Mills, Frederick Samuel, Frodsham, Cheshire, Draper. Aug 7 at 11 at offices of Linaker, High st, Runcorn

Mangall, Henry Russell Atlie, Sheffield, Draper. Aug 10 at 11 at offices of Binney and Sons, Queen st, chambers, Sheffield

Oddy, John, Leeds, Box Manufacturer. Aug 13 at 2 at offices of Hardwick, Boat Lane, Leeds

Ogburn, Frederick John, Brighton, Sussex, Baker. Aug 12 at 4 at the Railway Hotel, Burgess Hill, Black and Co, Brighton

Painter, John, Birmingham, Beer Retailer. Aug 8 at 10.15 at offices of East, Colmore Row, Birmingham

Palfrey, James, Hinton, Devon, Dealer in Berlin Wools. Aug 10 at 12 at offices of Gamble and Harveys, Gresham Buildings, Basildon st, Watts, Yeovil

Parkes, William Starr, Hereford, Baker. Aug 10 at 12 at offices of Corner, High town, Hereford

Pettit, George, Ball's Pond rd, Watchmaker. Aug 19 at 3 at offices of Holloway, Ball's Pond rd

Pollard, Edward Hutchinson, Hillington, Middlesex, Barrister-at-Law. Aug 10 at 2 at offices of Halse and Co, Cheapside

Pounder, John, Manchester, Poultry Salesman. Aug 13 at 3 at the Spread Eagle Hotel, Corporation st, Manchester. Dawson, Manchester

Prye, William jun, Bognor, Sussex, Tailor. Aug 15 at 12 at Dolly's Coffee house, King's head Passage, Newgate st, Leekett, Worthing

Rosenthal, Juilas Loewe, Tavistock st, Badford sq, Jeweller. Aug 11 at 3 at offices of Lee, Gresham Buildings, Basinghall st

Rossiter, Harry, Shaftesbury st, Shoreditch, Brush Maker. Aug 20 at 3 at offices of Holloway, Ball's Pond rd, Heathfield, Lincoln's Inn Fields

Shepherd, Robert, Wimbledon, Surrey, Draper. Aug 8 at 2 at Anderson's Hotel, Fleet st, Moore

Sheppard, George Yes, Southport, Draper. Aug 11 at 3 at offices of Barker, London st, Southport

Short, David, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Merchant. Aug 10 at 12 at offices of Hoyne and Co, Collingwood st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Study, Thomas, Ludgate Hill, African Merchant. Aug 12 at 3 at offices of Stocken and Jupp, Lime st, square

Truffitt, William, Scarborough, York, Fisherman. Aug 10 at 3 at office of Hick, Elder st, Scarborough

Vospur, William, Redhill, Surrey, Tailor. Aug 19 at 3 at offices of Howell, Cheapside

Ward, Joseph William, Heath st, Hampstead, Surgeon. Aug 4 at 11 at offices of Bixter, St Michael house, Cornhill

Watkins, Edward, Brynmawr, Brecon, Grocer. Aug 8 at 3 at the Westgate Hotel, Newport, Jones, Abergavenny

Westier, Horace, Brighton, Sussex, Pianoforte Dealer. Aug 13 at 1 at offices of Gutteridge, Ship st, Brighton

Whitehurst, Edwin, Maclesfield, Cheshire, Journeyman Silk Dyer. Aug 10 at 3 at the Old King's Head Inn, Chestergate, Maclesfield

Tremewan, Manchester

Willan, John, Wilmot, Cheshire, Saddler Maker. Aug 13 at 2 at offices of Chew and Sons, Swan st, Manchester

Wright, Thomas, Dover, Kent, Shoe Manufacturer. Aug 18 at 3 at the Victoria Hotel, Russell st, Dover. Till, Folkestone

## EDE AND SON,

 ROBE MAKERS.

By Special Appointment To HER MAJESTY, THE LORD CHANCELLOR, THE Whole of the Judicial Bench, Corporation of London, &c.

SOLICITORS' AND REGISTRARS' GOWNS.

BARRISTERS' AND QUEEN'S COUNSEL'S DITTO.

CORPORATION ROBES.

UNIVERSITY AND CLERGY GOWNS, &c.

ESTABLISHED 1689.

94, CHANCERY-LANE, LONDON.

**FUNERAL REFORM.**—The exorbitant items

of the Undertaker's bill have long operated as an oppressive tax upon all classes of the community. With a view of applying a remedy to this serious evil the LONDON NECROPOLIS COMPANY, when opening their extensive cemetery at Woking, held themselves prepared to undertake the whole duties relating to interments at fixed and moderate scales of charge, from which sum voters may choose according to their means and the requirements of the case. The Company also undertakes the conduct of Funerals to other cemeteries, and to all parts of the United Kingdom. A pamphlet containing full particulars may be obtained, or will be forwarded, upon application to the Chief Office, Lancaster-place, Strand, W.C.

# MILNERS SAFE COMPANY (LIMITED).

Incorporated under the Companies Acts, 1862 and 1867.

**CAPITAL £150,000 IN 15,000 SHARES OF £10 EACH,**

OF WHICH 10,500 ARE NOW OFFERED FOR SUBSCRIPTION.

Payable as follows:—

£1 per Share . . . . .	on Application,
2 " " . . . . .	on Allotment,
2 " " . . . . .	on the 1st day of December, 1874,
2 " " . . . . .	on the 1st day of March, 1875,

And the remaining £3 on the 1st day of June, 1875.

DIVIDENDS WILL ACCRUE FROM THE DATES OF PAYMENT.

WITH POWER TO ISSUE DEBENTURES TO THE AMOUNT OF £70,000.

## DIRECTORS.

C. T. RITCHIE, Esq., M.P.

W. T. CHARLEY, Esq., M.P.

D. R. RATCLIFF, Esq., Liverpool, Managing Director.

BANKERS—NORTH AND SOUTH WALES BANK, Liverpool, and their Branches; and their agents—

THE LONDON AND WESTMINSTER BANK, Lothbury, and Branches.

SOLICITORS—Messrs. PADDISON & SON, 57, Lincoln's Inn Fields, London.

BROKERS—Messrs. LINDOW & KING, 5, Angel Court, Throgmorton Street, London, E.C.

AUDITORS—Messrs. SULLY & GIRDLESTONE, Gresham House, Old Broad Street.

SECRETARY (pro tem.)—S. H. McMULLEN, Esq.

TEMPORARY OFFICES (until Milners Buildings, Finsbury, are completed)—70, CORNHILL.

## PROSPECTUS.

This Company has been formed to take over the important business of MESSRS. THOS. MILNER & SON, Holdfast Fire-resisting Safe Manufacturers, Phoenix Safe Works, Liverpool, Manchester, London, &c.

The present change in the constitution of the business is necessitated by the declining health of the head of the firm, and the growing responsibility attached to a large and increasing trade.

The business of MESSRS. THOMAS MILNER & SON has been successfully carried on for nearly a century by the late Mr. THOMAS MILNER, and by the present senior partner, Mr. WILLIAM MILNER, and by Mr. D. R. RATCLIFF. MILNER'S Safes have an established reputation throughout the commercial world, and the frequent tests to which they have been publicly subjected, together with the hundreds of destructive fires in which their Safes have proved their efficiency, render further comment unnecessary as to their character and repute.

The undertaking is in a flourishing condition, and will be taken over as a going concern in full and profitable work, as from 1st June last.

Mr. D. R. RATCLIFF, the junior partner of the firm, who has had the active management of the business for the last ten years, will be Managing Director, so that the Company will retain the benefit of his practical experience.

Messrs. THOMAS MILNER & SON transfer to the Company all their interest and property in the extensive Freehold Works and Buildings known as "The Phoenix Safe Works," Liverpool, together with the large plant and stock-in-trade appertaining thereto; a large Freehold Building, situate in Finsbury Place, London, and Leasehold Premises in Moorgate Street, London, Market Street, Manchester, and Lord Street, Liverpool, together with the goodwill, patents, trade marks, and all interest in existing contracts, which are of large extent, and of a highly remunerative character.

The Freehold Works known as "The Phoenix Safe Works," Smithdown Road, the Freehold Houses in Aigburth Street, and the Leasehold Premises in Lord Street, Liverpool, have been valued by Messrs. THOS. WAINWRIGHT & SON, of Liverpool; the Freehold Premises in Finsbury, London, have been valued by J. WHITCHURCH, Esq.; and the leasehold Premises, Market Street, Manchester, have been valued by Messrs. THOMAS ACTON & SONS: the aggregate valuations amounting to the sum of £47,817 10s. Od.

The fixed and loose plant, machinery, tools, materials, finished and unfinished goods at the Works have been valued by JAMES KENNEDY, Esq., of Liverpool, in the sum of £57,634 17s. 8d.

The Stocks in the hands of the various Agents are to be taken over at cost price.

The sum to be paid for patents, goodwill, trade marks, and profit on existing contracts, etc., is £50,000.

The Books have been carefully investigated by Messrs. SULLY & GIRDLESTONE, of Gresham House, London, who report that the amount which will be available for dividends, based on the profits, as shown by the Trading Account to 31st December last, will be upwards of £21,000 per annum.

The only contract affecting the Company is one dated the 29th day of July, 1874, and made between WILLIAM MILNER and DANIEL ROWLINSON RATCLIFF, carrying on business under the firm of "THOMAS MILNER & SON," of the one part, and JOHN MACDONALD, as Trustee for the Company, of the other part.

The purchase-money is £155,452 7s. 8d., in addition to £30,236 10s. 6d., the cost price of the stocks in the hands of Agents. The Vendors will take in part payment of the purchase-money £35,000 in the fully paid-up Shares of the Company, and £60,000 in Debentures at 6 per cent., redeemable over a period of 30 years, from 1st day of June, 1879.

Copies of the contract and valuations can be seen at the offices of the Company, and of the Solicitors.

Prospectuses and Forms of Application for Shares may be obtained of the Bankers, Brokers, or Secretary of the Company, London, 31st July, 1874.

Capital £150,000, in 15,000 Shares of £10 each.

MILNERS SAFE COMPANY, LIMITED.

Issue of 10,500 Shares of £10 each, with power to issue Debentures to the amount of £70,000.

## FORM OF APPLICATION.

\* \* \* If more convenient, this Form may be sent by Post to the Bankers with a crossed Cheque or Post Office Order made payable to them, in which case the Bankers will return the receipt to the Applicant.

To the Directors of Milner's Safe Company, Limited.  
GENTLEMEN.—Having paid to your credit at your Bankers the Sum of Pounds, being £1 per Share on application for Shares of £10 each in Milner's Safe Company, Limited, I hereby agree to accept such Shares or any less number that you may allot to me, on the conditions stated in the Prospectus, dated the 31st day of July, 1874, and subject to the Memorandum and Articles of Association of the Company.

Name (in full) . . . . .
Address . . . . .
Profession (if any) . . . . .
Date . . . . .
Signature . . . . .